

1994 NCAA

CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

88th Annual Convention ☐ January 8-12, 1994 ☐ San Antonio, Texas

National Collegiate Athletic Association

1994 NCAA

CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

National Collegiate Athletic Association



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

6201 College Boulevard
Overland Park, Kansas 66211-2422
913/339-1906
April 1994

Edited By: Michael V. Earle, *Director of Publishing.*

Distributed to chief executive officers, conference commissioners, affiliated and corresponding members.

NCAA, NCAA seal, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

Table of Contents

I. Register 1994	9
Administrative Organization.....	28
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Media.....	60
II. Proceedings at the 88th NCAA Convention	60
Opening Business Session	63
Opening Remarks	63
Convention Committees	65
Report of Council	66
Report of Special Committee to Study Rules Federation by Sport.....	68
Report of Memorial Resolutions Committee.....	74
State of the Association Address	74
Division I-A Business Session	74
Opening Remarks.....	74
Proposed Amendments.....	74
Eligibility — Seasons of Competition (No. 17).....	75
Scouting of Opponents — Football and Basketball (No. 24)	75
Athletically Related Income (No. 28)	76
Recruiting Coordinator — Divisions I-A and I-AA Football (No. 30)	78
Off-Campus Recruiting — Division I Football (No. 31)	80
Contacts and Evaluations — Divisions I-A and I-AA Football (No. 33)	80
Official Visits — Division I Football and Basketball (No. 38)	80
Telephone Calls — Divisions I and II Football (No. 41).....	80
Summer Financial Aid (No. 43)	83
Division I-A Football — Preseason Squad Limit (No. 44).....	83
Preseason Football Practice — Orientation Period (No. 46).....	84
Graduate Assistant Coach — Division I-A (No. 55)	85
One-Time Transfer Exception — Division I-A Football (No. 74).....	86
Spring Football Practice — Divisions I-A and I-AA (No. 112).....	86
Spring Football Practice — Divisions I-A and I-AA (No. 113).....	87
Training-Table Meals (No. 126).....	88
Pregame Housing (No. 127).....	88
Recruiting — Telephone Calls — Division I (No. 140)	90
Division I-AA Business Session.....	90
Opening Remarks.....	90
Proposed Amendments	90
Maximum Awards — Division I-AA Football (No. 87)	93
Eligibility — Seasons of Competition (No. 17).....	93
Scouting of Opponents — Football and Basketball (No. 24).....	94
Recruiting Coordinator — Divisions I-A and I-AA Football (No. 30).....	94
Coaching Limitations — Division I-AA Football (No. 32).....	96
Off-Campus Recruiting — Division I Football (No. 31).....	96
Contacts and Evaluations — Divisions I-A and I-AA Football (No. 33)	96
Official Visits — Division I Football and Basketball (No. 38)	98
Division I-AA Football — Preseason Squad Limit (No. 45).....	99
Telephone Calls — Divisions I and II Football (No. 41).....	100
Preseason Football Practice Seasons — Orientation Period (No. 46).....	100
Maximum Awards — Division I-AA Football (No. 88)	103
Comments	105
Proposed Amendments	105
Financial Aid — Division I-AA Football (No. 90).....	105
Financial Aid — Division I-AA Football Exception (No. 89).....	105
Spring Football Practice — Divisions I-A and I-AA (No. 112)	105

Spring Football Practice — Divisions I-A and I-AA (No. 113)	105
Meals During Unofficial Visits — Division I-AA Football (No. 142)	106
Closing Comments	107
Division I-AAA Business Session	108
Opening Remarks	108
Review of Proposed Amendments	108
Division II Business Session	109
Opening Remarks	109
Review of Proposed Amendments	109
Proposed Amendments	115
Sports Sponsorship — Emerging Sports for Women (No. 12)	115
Change of Division Membership — Notification and Championships Eligibility (No. 15)	116
Eligibility — Seasons of Competition (No. 17)	117
Expenses — Travel-Squad Size Limitations (No. 23)	119
Athletically Related Income (No. 28)	121
Recruiting Materials (No. 40)	122
Telephone Calls — Divisions I and II Football (No. 41)	122
Playing and Practice Seasons — Division II (No. 96)	123
Playing and Practice Seasons — Basketball Practice (No. 47)	125
Reconsideration of Voting Action	128
Reconsideration of Recruiting Materials (No. 40)	128
Proposed Amendments	130
Noninstitutional Publications (No. 58)	130
Scouting of Opponents (No. 59)	130
Drug-Testing Consent Form and Squad List — Nonrecruited Student-Athlete (No. 62)	131
Season of Competition (No. 63)	132
Playing and Practice Seasons — Divisions I and II Baseball (No. 50)	132
Full-Time Enrollment — Correspondence Courses (No. 67)	132
Regular Academic Year — Correspondence Courses (No. 68)	133
Eligibility — Five-Year/10-Semester Rule (No. 71)	133
Academic Degree Requirements — Two-Year College Transfers (No. 72)	133
Eligibility — Two-Year College Transfer (No. 73)	134
One-Time Transfer Exception — Division II (No. 75)	136
Summer Basketball Leagues — Transfer Student (No. 77)	136
Financial Aid — Employment Earnings and Athletics Participation Compensation (No. 81)	137
Financial Aid — Pell Grant (No. 84)	137
Required Day Off During Playing Season (No. 93)	138
Contest Exemptions — Division II Football (No. 114)	138
Spring Football Practice — Division II (No. 115)	140
Waivers	141
Nominating Committee	141
Continuation of Division II Business Session	141
Opening Remarks	142
Proposed Amendments	142
Playing and Practice Seasons — Golf (No. 117)	142
Clearinghouse Fee — Nonrecruited Student-Athlete (No. 128)	142
Transfer — Hearing Opportunity (No. 133)	143
Recruiting — Division II Tryouts (No. 137)	143
Evaluations — Division II Men's Basketball (No. 138)	145
Recruiting — Automobile Transportation (No. 141)	146
Recruiting — Gifts at Coaches' Clinics (No. 145)	146
Recruitment (No. 162)	146
One-Visit-Per-Week Limit on Visits to Prospect's High School — Sports Other than Football and Basketball (No. 163)	147

One-Visit-Per-Week Limit on Visits to Prospect's High School — Football and Basketball (No. 164)	147
Contact With Parents at Site of Competition (No. 165)	148
Permissible Recruiters (No. 166)	148
Telephone Calls (No. 168)	150
Travel to Official Visit — Reimbursement (No. 169)	150
Publicity (No. 170)	150
Camps and Clinics — Senior Prospect Prohibition (No. 171)	151
Camps and Clinics — Employment of High-School Coaches (No. 173)	152
Reconsideration of Voting Action	152
Reconsideration of Financial Aid — Pell Grant (No. 84)	153
Issues Forum	176
Closing Remarks	177
Division III Business Session	177
Opening Remarks	178
Reports of Committees	178
Steering Committee	179
Presidents Commission	180
Proposed Amendments	180
Sports Sponsorship — Emerging Sports for Women (No. 12)	181
Discussion	192
Proposed Amendments	192
Sports Sponsorship — Emerging Sports for Women (No. 12)	192
Official Visit — Meals (No. 39)	192
Playing and Practice Seasons — Basketball Practice (No. 49)	194
Contest Limitations — Division III Baseball (No. 51)	197
Reports of Committees	197
Ethical Behavior	198
Rules Federation by Sport	199
Nominating Committee	199
Proposed Amendments	199
Season of Competition (No. 63)	200
Full-Time Enrollment — Correspondence Courses (No. 67)	200
Eligibility — Five-Year/10 Semester Rule (No. 71)	201
Financial Aid — Employment Earnings and Athletics Participation Compensation (No. 81)	201
Required Day Off During Playing Season (No. 93)	201
Contest Limitations — Division III Baseball (No. 102)	202
Division III Playing and Practice Seasons (No. 109)	203
Division III Playing and Practice Seasons — Traditional and Nontraditional Segment (No. 107)	203
Division III Playing and Practice Seasons (No. 108)	203
Dates of Competition — Division III (No. 110)	204
Pregame Housing (No. 127)	204
Transfer — Hearing Opportunity (No. 133)	205
Recruiting — Automobile Transportation (No. 141)	205
Recruitment (No. 162)	206
Contact With Parents at Site of Competition (No. 165)	206
Travel to Official Visit — Reimbursement (No. 169)	206
Publicity (No. 170)	207
Camps and Clinics — Senior Prospect Prohibition (No. 171)	207
Camps and Clinics — Employment of High-School Coaches (No. 173)	208
Recruiting — Gifts at Coaches' Clinics (No. 145)	208
Reconsideration of Voting Action	208
Reconsideration of Division III Playing and Practice Seasons (No. 109)	210
Continuation of Division III Business Session	211
Reports of Committees	211

Special Committee to Review Student-Athlete Welfare, Access and Equity.....	211
Championships Committee.....	212
Executive Committee.....	214
Waivers.....	215
Reconsideration of Voting Actions.....	215
Reconsideration of Pregame Housing (No. 127)	215
Closing Remarks.....	215
Division I Business Session	218
Opening Remarks.....	218
Proposed Amendments.....	218
Sports Sponsorship — Emerging Sports for Women (No. 12).....	218
Satisfactory Progress — Regular Academic Year (No. 22).....	218
Expenses — Travel-Squad Size Limitations (No. 23).....	219
Scouting of Opponents — Football and Basketball (No. 24).....	221
Restricted-Earnings Coach (No. 27).....	221
Athletically Related Income (No. 28)	222
Contacts and Evaluations — Division I Football and Basketball (No. 34).....	223
Division I Football and Basketball — Recruiting Calendars (No. 35).....	223
Official Visits — Division I Football and Basketball (No. 38).....	224
Official Visits — Meals (No. 39).....	225
Recruiting Materials (No. 40).....	225
Maximum Awards — Division I Men's Basketball (No. 42).....	227
Playing and Practice Seasons — Basketball Practice (No. 47).....	232
Resolution: Review of Initial-Eligibility Requirements (No. 174).....	232
Playing and Practice Seasons — Divisions I and II Baseball (No. 50).....	234
Volunteer Coach (No. 57).....	235
Noninstitutional Publications (No. 58).....	236
Scouting of Opponents — Division I (No. 60).....	237
Drug-Testing Consent Form and Squad List — Nonrecruited Student-Athlete (No. 62).....	237
Season of Competition (No. 63).....	237
Two-Year College Hardship Waiver — Division I (No. 64).....	238
Continuation of Division I Business Session	238
Opening Remarks.....	238
Proposed Amendments.....	238
Initial Eligibility — Core-Curriculum Requirements (No. 65).....	238
Full-Time Enrollment — Correspondence Courses (No. 67).....	239
Regular Academic Year — Correspondence Courses (No. 68).....	239
Satisfactory Progress — Midyear Certification Option (No. 69)	240
Satisfactory Progress — Part-Time Enrollment (No. 70).....	240
Eligibility — Five-Year/10-Semester Rule (No. 71).....	241
Academic Degree Requirements — Two-Year College Transfers (No. 72).....	241
Eligibility — Two-Year College Transfer (No. 73).....	242
Outside Competition — Division I (No. 76).....	242
Summer Basketball Leagues — Transfer Student (No. 77).....	243
Financial Aid — Employment Earnings and Athletics Participation Compensation (No. 81).....	244
Financial Aid — Division I Ice Hockey (No. 91).....	244
Maximum Awards — Women's Gymnastics (No. 92)	245
Required Day Off During Playing Season (No. 93).....	248
Safety Exception — Wrestling (No. 95).....	248
Length of Season — Divisions I and II Softball and Women's Volleyball (No. 97)	250
Weekly Hour Limitations — Softball and Women's Volleyball (No. 98).....	251

Division I Softball — National Invitational Championship (No. 99).....	251
Volleyball — National Invitational Volleyball Championship (No. 100).....	252
Contest Exemptions — Division I Women's Basketball (No. 104).....	252
Contest Exemptions — Division I Basketball (No. 105)	252
Contest Exemptions — Division I Basketball (No. 106)	253
Playing and Practice Seasons — Golf (No. 117)	253
Golf — College-Am Fund-Raiser (No. 118).....	253
Maximum Dates of Competition — Tennis (No. 119).....	254
Clearinghouse Fee — Nonrecruited Student-Athlete (No. 128).....	255
Complimentary Admissions (No. 129).....	255
Transfer — Hearing Opportunity (No. 133)	257
Reconsideration of Safety Exception — Wrestling (No. 95).....	258
Recruiting Evaluations (No. 134)	259
Recruiting — Telephone Calls — Division I (No. 140).....	260
Recruiting — Automobile Transportation (No. 141)	260
Unofficial Visit — Parking (No. 143).....	260
Recruiting — Gifts at Coaches' Clinics (No. 145)	261
Summer Basketball Event Certification (No. 146).....	261
Recruitment (No. 162).....	262
One-Visit-Per-Week Limit on Visits to Prospect's High School — Sports Other than Football and Basketball (No. 163).....	262
Reconsideration of Complimentary Admissions (No. 129).....	262
Contact With Parents at Site of Competition (No. 165).....	264
Permissible Recruiters (No. 166).....	264
Visits — Participation by Prospect in Recreational Activities (No. 167)	265
Telephone Calls (No. 168).....	265
Travel to Official Visit — Reimbursement (No. 169).....	266
Publicity (No. 170).....	266
Camps and Clinics — Senior Prospect Prohibition (No. 171).....	267
Nominating Committee.....	267
Proposed Amendments.....	267
Camps and Clinics — Employment of Student-Athletes (No. 172).....	267
Camps and Clinics — Employment of High-School Coaches (No. 173).....	268
NCAA Honors Dinner	269
General Business Session	289
Opening Remarks	289
Reconsideration of Voting Action	289
Reconsideration of Off-Campus Recruiting — Division I Football (No. 31).....	289
Reconsideration of Preseason Football Practice — Orientation Period (No. 46).....	289
Proposed Amendments.....	291
Principle of Gender Equity (No. 11)	291
Resolution: NCAA Membership Structure (No. 13)	292
Provisional Membership Category (No. 14).....	292
Resolution: Need-Based Financial Aid (No. 16).....	296
Resolution: Five Seasons of Competition (No. 18).....	296
Resolution: Five Seasons of Competition (No. 18).....	299
Revised Legislative Calendar (No. 19).....	299
Resolution: Biennial Convention (No. 20).....	299
Independent Hearing Officer (No. 21).....	300
Resolution: The Student-Athlete: Welfare, Access and Equity (No. 52)	300
Resolution: Integrity: Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct in Intercollegiate Athletics (No. 53).....	301
Continuation of General Business Session	302
Reports.....	302
Supplement to Memorial Resolutions Committee Report.....	302
Opening Remarks	302

Reconsideration of Voting Action.....	303
Reconsideration of Training-Table Meals (No. 126)	303
Proposed Amendments.....	304
Eligibility Committee — Appeal Procedures (No. 78).....	304
Marketing Student-Athlete to Professional Teams (No. 54).....	304
On-Campus Employment (No. 79).....	305
State Reciprocity Tuition Agreements (No. 82)	306
Financial Aid — Permissible Fees (No. 83)	308
Financial Aid from Outside Source — Athletics Participation Not Major Criterion (No. 85)	309
Summer Baseball — Staff Limitations (No. 103)	309
Multidivision Classification (No. 111)	310
Amateurism — Basketball Draft (No. 120)	310
Promotional Activities — Player/Trading Cards (No. 121)	311
Payment for Commercial Advertisements (No. 122)	311
Travel Expenses to Olympic Games (No. 123).....	312
Developmental Training Expenses (No. 124).....	313
Travel Expenses — Exception (No. 130).....	313
Professional Sports Counseling Panels (No. 125).....	314
Travel Expenses — NCAA Championships and Postseason Bowl Games (No. 131).....	314
Expenses — Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Meetings (No. 132) ..	314
Budgetary Control (No. 147).....	316
Tobacco Products (No. 149).....	317
Committees — Term of Office (No. 150).....	319
Sports Committees (No. 151)	320
Enforcement — Mission Statement (No. 152).....	320
Enforcement — Secondary and Major Violations (No. 153).....	320
Enforcement — Secondary Violations (No. 154).....	321
Enforcement — Major Violations (No. 155).....	321
Committee Reports.....	322
Proposed Amendments.....	322
Enforcement — Repeat Violators (No. 156).....	322
NCAA Infractions Appeals Committee (No. 157).....	322
Minimum Sponsorship Requirements — Championships (No. 158).....	323
Multidivision Classification (No. 159).....	323
Championships — Automatic Qualification (No. 160)	324
Championships — Mixed Team (No. 161).....	325
Closing Remarks	326

III. Appendices

A. Legislative Proposals	A-1
B. Roll-Call Voting.....	A-218
C. Convention Committees	A-260
D. Past Convention Sites	A-262
E. NCAA Officers, 1906-1994.....	A-264

Administrative Organization

NCAA Joint Policy Board

The Joint Policy Board consists of the Administrative Committee, listed below, and the officers of the Presidents Commission, as listed on page 16.

NCAA Staff Liaison:

TED C. TOW

NCAA Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee includes the NCAA officers (president, secretary-treasurer, division vice-presidents) and the NCAA executive director.

President

JOSEPH N. CROWLEY

President

University of Nevada

Reno, Nevada 89557

(Term Expires January 1995*)

Secretary-Treasurer

PRENTICE GAUTT

Associate Commissioner

Big Eight Conference

104 West Ninth Street, Suite 408

Kansas City, Missouri 64105-1755

(Term Expires January 1995*)

Executive Director

CEDRIC W. DEMPSEY

6201 College Boulevard

Overland Park, Kansas 66211-2422

Division I Vice-President: R. Elaine Dreidame, University of Dayton
(Term Expires January 1994*)

Division II Vice-President: Charles N. Lindemann, Humboldt State
University (Term Expires January 1995*)

Division III Vice-President: John H. Harvey, Carnegie Mellon University
(Term Expires January 1994*)

NCAA Staff Liaison:

TED C. TOW

NCAA Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chair and secretary, respectively. The other 44 members of the

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Council shall include 22 members from Division I (including at least two chief executive officers and at least six women), 11 members from Division II (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women), and 11 members from Division III (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women). The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the membership of that division present and voting at the division business session during the annual Convention. [Constitution 4.1.]

Division Steering Committees: The representatives of each division on the Council make up the steering committee for each division (i.e., Division I steering committee includes all members of Division I on the Council, Division II steering committee includes all members of Division II on the Council and Division III steering committee includes all members of Division III on the Council).

Division I		
Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Warner Alford Director of Athletics University of Mississippi University, Mississippi 38677	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
Robert A. Alost President Northwestern State University Natchitoches, Louisiana 71497	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1996*
Paul V. Amodio Director of Athletics Kent State University Kent, Ohio 44242	I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1997*
Robert J. Baugh Dean, College of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Athletics Eastern Kentucky University Richmond, Kentucky 40475-3101	I-AA Central (Region 2)	Jan. 1997*
Charles Cavagnaro Director of Athletics Memphis State University Memphis, Tennessee 38152	I-A Independent South (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*
Irwin M. Cohen Assistant to the President Northeastern University Boston, Massachusetts 02115	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1994*
R. Elaine Drerdame Senior Associate Director of Athletics University of Dayton Dayton, Ohio 45469-1220	I-AAA (I-AA 9-1-93) (Region 3)	Jan. 1994*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Daniel G. Gibbens Professor of Law University of Oklahoma Norman, Oklahoma 73019	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1994*
Mildred B. Griggs Professor of Education University of Illinois Champaign, Illinois 61820	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1997*
John V. Kasser Director of Athletics University of California Santa Barbara, California 93106	I-A Big West Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1995
Jerry L. Kingston Professor of Economics Arizona State University Tempe, Arizona 85287-2505	I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1996*
Jim G. Malik Professor of Chemistry San Diego State University San Diego, California 92182-0328	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1994*
Chris Monasch Commissioner Northeast Conference 900 Route 9 Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*
Richard A. Rosenthal Director of Athletics University of Notre Dame Notre Dame, Indiana 46556	I-A Independent North (Region 3)	Jan. 1996*
William M. Sangster Director of International Programs Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0590	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1996*
Doris R. Soladay Associate Director of Athletics Syracuse University Syracuse, New York 13244-5020	I-A Big East Conference (Region 1)	Jan. 1995*
Robert M. Sweazy Vice-Provost for Research Texas Tech University Lubbock, Texas 79409-1035	I-A Southwest Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1997*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Patricia V. Viverito Commissioner, Gateway Football Conference, Senior Associate Commissioner, Missouri Valley Conference 100 North Broadway, Suite 1135 St. Louis, Missouri 63102	I-At Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1995*
Shirley A. Walker Coordinator of Women's Sports/ Head Women's Basketball Coach Alcorn State University Lorman, Mississippi 39096	I-At Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1995*
Mary Jo Warner Senior Associate Director of Athletics George Washington University Washington, D.C. 20052	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*
Lt. Gen. Claudius E. Watts III President The Citadel Charleston, South Carolina 29409	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1997*
W. Wayne Wright Director of Athletics Pepperdine University Malibu, California 90263	I-AAA (Region 4)	Jan. 1994*

Division II

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Ollie M. Bowman Dean of Admissions Hampton University Hampton, Virginia 23668 (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*
Clint Bryant Director of Athletics Augusta College Augusta, Georgia 30904-2200 (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
Rita M. Castagna Director of Athletics Assumption College Worcester, Massachusetts 01615-0005 (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*
Dorothy E. Dreyer Assistant Professor of Communication Disorders and Sciences Wayne State University Detroit, Michigan 48202 (Region 3)	Jan. 1994*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Richard A. Johanningmeier Director of Athletics Washburn University Topeka, Kansas 66621 (Region 4)	Jan. 1996*
Janet R. Kittell Director of Athletics California State University Chico, California 95929-0300 (Region 4)	Jan. 1996*
Charles N. Lindemann Director of Athletics Humboldt State University Arcata, California 95521 (Region 4)	Jan. 1995*
Harold J. McGee President Jacksonville State University Jacksonville, Alabama 36265 (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
David P. O'Toole Professor of Mathematics and Computer Science Bellarmine College Louisville, Kentucky 40205 (Region 3)	Jan. 1997*
Shirley Green Reese Associate Director of Athletics Albany State College Albany, Georgia 31705 (Region 2)	Jan. 1997*
Diane L. Reinhard President Clarion University of Pennsylvania Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214 (Region 1)	

Division III

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Dolores A. Bogard Associate Director of Athletics State University College Cortland, New York 13045 (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Robert G. Bottoms President DePauw University Greencastle, Indiana 46135 (Region 3)	Jan. 1995*
Daniel L. Bridges Director of Athletics California Institute of Technology Pasadena, California 91125 (Region 4)	Jan. 1997*
Edward G. Coll Jr. President Alfred University Alfred, New York 14802-1232 (Region 2)	Jan. 1997*
Dennis M. Collins Executive Director North Coast Athletic Conference 24700 Center Ridge Road, #10 Westlake, Ohio 44145 (Region 3)	Jan. 1996*
Marjorie B. Giles Dean of Students Central College Pella, Iowa 50219 (Region 4)	Jan. 1994*
John H. Harvey Director of Athletics Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213 (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
Linda S. Moulton Director of Athletics Clark University Worcester, Massachusetts 01610-1477 (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*
Lawrence R. Schiner Director of Athletics and Faculty Athletics Representative Jersey City State College Jersey City, New Jersey 07305-1597 (Region 1)	Jan. 1997*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Sandra R. Weeden Associate Professor of Education/ Director of Women's Athletics State University of New York Stony Brook, New York 11794-3500 (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*
Robert E. Williams Director of Athletics Swarthmore College Swarthmore, Pennsylvania 19081-1397 (Region 2)	Jan. 1994
<i>NCAA Staff Liaison:</i>	
Cedric W. Dempsey (Executive Director)	
Ted C. Tow (Council, Division I), primary staff liaison	
Stephen A. Mallonee (Division II)	
Daniel T. Dutcher (Division III)	
Nancy L. Mitchell (Legislation and Interpretations)	
Stephen R. Morgan (Legislation and Interpretations)	
John H. Leavens (Recording Secretary)	
Lydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)	

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Presidents Commission

The Presidents Commission is elected by a mail vote of the chief executive officers of all member institutions (or selected by the Division I-A conferences). The 44 members shall include 22 who shall represent Division I members, 11 who shall represent Division II members and 11 who shall represent Division III members. At least three women shall be included, preferably one from each division. The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the chief executive officers of that division (or by the Division I-A conferences). The officers of the Presidents Commission are elected from among the members of the Commission by a majority vote of the Commission's members to serve for two years.

	Term as Chair Expires
Commission Chair: Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien University of New Orleans	Jan. 1994*
Division I Chair: Charles E. Young University of California, Los Angeles	Jan. 1994*
Division II Chair: Arend D. Lubbers Grand Valley State University	Jan. 1994*
Division III Chair: Claire L. Gaudiani Connecticut College	Jan. 1995

Division I

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Judith E. N. Albino President University of Colorado System Boulder, Colorado 80309	I-A At Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1996*
Richard L. Bowen President Idaho State University Pocatello, Idaho 82109	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1996*
Anthony J. DiGiorgio President Winthrop University Rock Hill, South Carolina 29733	I-AAA At Large (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
James E. Halligan President New Mexico State University Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003	I-A Big West Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1995
Thomas K. Hearn Jr. President Wake Forest University Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27109	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Eamon M. Kelly President Tulane University New Orleans, Louisiana 70118	I-A Independent (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
J. Barton Luedeke President Rider College Lawrenceville, New Jersey 08648-3099	I-AAA At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1994
James D. McComas President Virginia Polytechnic Institute Blacksburg, Virginia 24061	I-A Big East Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1997*
William H. Mobley Chancellor Texas A&M University System College Station, Texas 77843-1122	I-A Southwest Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1994
Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien Chancellor University of New Orleans New Orleans, Louisiana 70148	I-AAA At Large (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*
Frederick W. Obear Chancellor University of Tennessee Chattanooga, Tennessee 37403	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*
Oscar C. Page President Austin Peay State University Clarksville, Tennessee 37044-4576	I-AA Central (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
Richard E. Peck President University of New Mexico Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1997*
Rev. Nicholas S. Rashford President St. Joseph's University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131	I-AAA At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1997*
Hunter R. Rawlings III President University of Iowa 101 Jessup Hall Iowa City, Iowa 55242-1316	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1996*
E. Roger Sayers President University of Alabama Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1996*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Brother Thomas J. Scanlan President Manhattan College Riverdale, New York 10471	I-AAA At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*
William E. Shelton President Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197	I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1997*
Gary A. Sojka President Bucknell University Lewisburg, Pennsylvania 17837	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1997*
William W. Sutton President Mississippi Valley State University Itta Bena, Mississippi 38941	I-AA At Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1997*
Jon Wefald President Kansas State University Manhattan, Kansas 66506	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1995*
Charles E. Young Chancellor University of California Los Angeles, California 90024	I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1994*

Division II

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Betty Turner Asher President University of South Dakota Vermillion, South Dakota 57069-2390 (Region 4)	Jan. 1995
Donald F. Behrend Chancellor University of Alaska Anchorage, Alaska 99508 (Region 4)	Jan. 1997*
Robert A. Burnett President Armstrong State College Savannah, Georgia 31419-1997 (Region 2)	Jan. 1995

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Thomas W. Cole Jr. President Clark Atlanta University Atlanta, Georgia 30314 (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
Joseph H. Hagan President Assumption College Worcester, Massachusetts 01615-0005 (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*
Adam W. Herbert President University of North Florida Jacksonville, Florida 32224-2645 (Region 2)	Jan. 1994
Rodney C. Kelchner President Mansfield University of Pennsylvania Mansfield, Pennsylvania 16933 (Region 1)	Jan. 1994*
Arend D. Lubbers President Grand Valley State University Allendale, Michigan 49401 (Region 3)	Jan. 1996*
Joseph J. McGowan Jr. President Bellarmine College Louisville, Kentucky 40205 (Region 3)	Jan. 1997*
Judith A. Ramaley President Portland State University Portland, Oregon 97207 (Region 4)	Jan. 1996*
Kent Wyatt President Delta State University Cleveland, Mississippi 38733 (Region 3)	

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Division III

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Michael F. Adams President Centre College Danville, Kentucky 40422-1394 (Region 3)	Jan. 1996*
James R. Appleton President University of Redlands Redlands, California 92373-0999 (Region 4)	Jan. 1995*
Robert J. Bruce President Widener University Chester, Pennsylvania 19013 (Region 2)	Jan. 1996*
David G. Carter President Eastern Connecticut State University Willimantic, Connecticut 06226 (Region 1)	Jan. 1997*
Alice Chandler President State University College New Paltz, New York 12562 (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*
Claire L. Gaudiani President Connecticut College New London, Connecticut 06320 (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*
Rev. Michael J. Lavelle President John Carroll University University Heights, Ohio 44118-4581 (Region 3)	Jan. 1995*
Michele Toela Myers President Denison University Granville, Ohio 43023 (Region 3)	Jan. 1997*
Daniel H. Perlman President Webster University Webster Groves, Missouri 63119 (Region 4)	Jan. 1997*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Name, Institution

Jon C. Strauss President Worcester Polytechnic Institute Worcester, Massachusetts 01609 (Region 1)	Jan. 1994*
Cordell Wynn President Stillman College Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35403 (Region 3)	Jan. 1995*
<i>NCAA Staff Liaison:</i>	
Cedric W. Dempsey (Executive Director)	
Ted C. Tow (Presidents Commission, Division I), primary staff liaison	
Stephen A. Mallonee (Division II)	
Daniel T. Dutcher (Division III)	
Nancy L. Mitchell (Legislation and Interpretations)	
Stephen R. Morgan (Legislation and Interpretations)	
John H. Leavens (Recording Secretary)	
Lydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)	

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

NCAA Executive Committee

The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The division vice-presidents shall be members, and the remaining nine members are elected by the Council for terms of five years. [Constitution 4.2.]

Division	Name, Institution	Term Expires
III	Mary R. Barrett Associate Director of Athletics University of Massachusetts Boston, Massachusetts 02125	Jan. 1996*
I-AA	Charles S. Boone Director of Athletics University of Richmond Richmond, Virginia 23173	Jan. 1995*
I-A	Joan C. Cronan Director of Women's Athletics University of Tennessee Knoxville, Tennessee 37996	Jan. 1997*
I-AAA	Don J. DiJulia Assistant Vice-President and Director of Athletics St. Joseph's University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131	Jan. 1995*
I VP I-AAA (I-AA 9-1-93)	R. Elaine Dreidame Senior Associate Director of Athletics University of Dayton Dayton, Ohio 45469-1220	Jan. 1994*
I-AA	Kenneth A. Free Commissioner Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference 102 North Elm Street, Suite 401 Greensboro, North Carolina 27401	Jan. 1996*
III VP	John H. Harvey Director of Athletics Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213	Jan. 1994*
I-A	Phyllis L. Howlett Assistant Commissioner Big Ten Conference 1500 West Higgins Road Park Ridge, Illinois 60068-6300	Jan. 1995*
II	Jerry M. Hughes Director of Athletics Central Missouri State University Warrensburg, Missouri 64093	Jan. 1996*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Division	Name, Institution	Term Expires
II VP	Charles N. Lindemann Director of Athletics Humboldt State University Arcata, California 95521	Jan. 1995*
I-A	John D. Swofford Director of Athletics University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514	Jan. 1995
I-A	Frank Windegger Director of Athletics Texas Christian University Fort Worth, Texas 76129-0001	Jan. 1998*

NCAA Staff Liaison:

Cedric W. Dempsey (Executive Director)
Patricia E. Bork (Executive Committee, Division I), primary staff liaison
Thomas W. Jernstedt (Division I)
Dennis L. Poppe (Division II)
Donna J. Noonan (Division III)
Frank E. Marshall (Business Affairs)
Lydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

NCAA National Office

Management Team

Cedric W. Dempsey, *Executive Director*
Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Deputy Executive Director/Chief Operating Officer*
Patricia E. Bork, *Group Executive Director for Championships and Event Management*
Francis M. Canavan, *Group Executive Director for Public Affairs*
Frank E. Marshall, *Group Executive Director for Administration and Finance*
Stephen R. Morgan, *Group Executive Director for Membership Services*

Executive Affairs

Louis J. Spry, *Associate Executive Director*
Ted C. Tow, *Associate Executive Director*
John E. Lamb, *Director of Aviation*
Lydia L. Sanchez, *Director of Conventions and Meetings/Assistant to the Executive Director*
Eugene M. Lamb, *Chief of Maintenance (Aviation)*

Administration and Finance Group

Stanley D. Johnson, *Director of Professional Development*
Keith E. Martin, *Director of Accounting*
Michael S. McNeely, *Director of Operations*
Daniel W. Spencer, *Director of Data Processing*
Frank D. Uryasz, *Director of Sports Sciences*
Ursula R. Walsh, *Director of Research*
Sarah T. Bobert, *Accountant*
Susan J. Brown, *Programmer/Analyst*
Douglas A. Carpenter, *Programmer/Analyst*
Kevin G. Clark, *Accountant*
Kathy L. Day, *Programmer/Analyst*
Randall W. Dick, *Assistant Director of Sports Sciences*
William C. Foreman, *Building Manager*
Marla B. Gleason, *Office Services Center Manager*
Ellen Hanley, *Assistant Director of Sports Sciences*
Richard W. Hanson, *Programmer/Analyst*
Mary J. Hill, *Programmer/Analyst*
Donna L. Hockersmith, *Administrative Assistant for Sports Sciences*
Suzanne M. Kerley, *Personnel Manager*
Allison Laubenstein, *Programmer/Analyst*
De Ann M. Mortensen, *Assistant Personnel Manager*
Todd A. Petr, *Assistant Director of Research*
Fannie B. Vaughan, *Executive Assistant*
Danny W. Womack, *Programmer/Analyst*

Championships and Event Management Group

Daniel A. Calandro, *Director of Division I Men's Basketball Operations*
William R. Hancock, *Director of Division I Men's Basketball Championship*
Donna J. Noonan, *Director of Championships*
Dennis L. Poppe, *Director of Championships*
Edward A. Thiebe, *Director of Youth Programs*
R. Wayne Burrow, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Philip A. Buttafuoco, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Sharon K. Cessna, *Youth Programs Coordinator*
Rochelle M. Collins, *Youth Programs Coordinator*
Carl E. Daniels, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Thomas A. Jacobs, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Harley W. Lewis, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Bernard M. Muir, *Assistant Director of Division I Men's Basketball Championship*
Deborah R. Nelson, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Christine M. Pohl, *Youth Programs Coordinator*
Michelle A. Pond, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Marie T. Tuite, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Membership Services Group

S. David Berst, *Assistant Executive Director for Enforcement*
John H. Leavens, *Assistant Executive Director for Compliance Services*
Nancy L. Mitchell, *Assistant Executive Director for Legislative Services*
Daniel T. Dutcher, *Director of Legislative Services*
Richard R. Hilliard, *Director of Enforcement*
Mark P. Jones, *Director of Enforcement*
Janet M. Justus, *Director of Eligibility*
David A. Knopp, *Director of Compliance Services*
Kevin C. Lennon, *Director of Compliance Services*
Stephen A. Mallonee, *Director of Legislative Services*
Robert J. Minnix, *Director of Enforcement*
Robert A. Oliver, *Director of Legislative Services*
Charles E. Smrt, *Director of Enforcement*
Craig W. Angelos, *Legislative Assistant*
Rebecca G. Bowman, *Compliance Representative*
David R. Brunk, *Compliance Representative*
Janet T. Calandro, *Compliance Representative*
Jacqueline Campbell, *Legislative Assistant*
Shepard C. Cooper, *Enforcement Representative*
Melisa A. Dehon, *Enforcement Representative*
Carolyn A. Dias, *Compliance Representative*
Carrie A. Doyle, *Enforcement Representative*
Jeffrey D. Freedman, *Eligibility Representative*
Cynthia J. Gabel, *Enforcement Representative*
Susan E. Glatter, *Eligibility Representative*

Carolayne Henry, *Legislative Assistant*
 Thomas C. Hosty, *Enforcement Representative*
 Shawna L. Hutchins, *Legislative Assistant*
 Charles A. Jones, *Compliance Representative*
 Gary F. Karner, *Compliance Representative*
 Valerie M. Lemoignan, *Legislative Assistant*
 Adrienne R. Lotson, *Enforcement Representative*
 Edward B. Lupomech, *Enforcement Representative*
 Shane Lyons, *Legislative Assistant*
 Michael J. Marcil, *Compliance Representative*
 Lori A. McQueen, *Enforcement Representative*
 Steven D. Nelson, *Enforcement Representative*
 Louis A. Onofrio, *Eligibility Representative*
 Amy P. Perko, *Enforcement Representative*
 Richard C. Perko, *Legislative Assistant*
 Les J. Pico, *Enforcement Representative*
 N. Bea Pray, *Compliance Representative*
 Garnett H. Purnell, *Compliance Representative*
 Marybeth Ruskamp, *Legislative Assistant*
 William S. Saum, *Enforcement Representative*
 Christopher D. Schoemann, *Legislative Assistant*
 Kathryn M. Statz, *Eligibility Representative*
 Dirk L. Taitt, *Enforcement Representative*
 Robert W. Thomas, *Compliance Representative*
 Guy H. Troupe, *Enforcement Representative*
 Shirley M. Whitacre, *Membership Coordinator*
 Stanley Wilcox, *Legislative Assistant*
 Athena Yiamouyiannis, *Legislative Assistant*

Public Affairs Group

David E. Cawood, *Assistant Executive Director for
Marketing and Broadcast Services*
 Wallace I. Renfro, *Assistant Executive Director for Publishing*
 Michael V. Earle, *Director of Publishing*
 James A. Marchiony, *Director of Broadcast Services*
 P. David Pickle, *Editor-in-Chief, The NCAA News*
 Victor M. Royal, *Director of Graphics*
 Will J. Rudd, *Director of the Visitors Center*
 John T. Waters, *Director of Licensing*
 Alfred B. White, *Director of Promotions*
 Maxine R. Alejos, *Circulation Manager*
 Martin T. Benson, *Publications Editor*
 Laura E. Bollig, *Publications Editor*
 Theodore A. Breidenthal, *Publications Editor*
 Gary T. Brown, *Publications Editor*
 Richard M. Campbell, *Statistics Coordinator*

Jack L. Copeland, *Managing Editor, The NCAA News*
 Leslie E. Drew, *Technical Director*
 Steven R. Hagwell, *Publications Editor*
 Jeffrey S. Hiller, *Assistant Director of the Visitors Center*
 Kerwin E. Hudson, *Assistant Director of Broadcast Services*
 Kathryn P. Jarboe, *Merchandise Manager*
 Gary K. Johnson, *Statistics Coordinator*
 Regina L. McNeal, *Assistant Director of Broadcast Services*
 Ronald D. Mott, *Editorial and Advertising Assistant, The NCAA News*
 Lee Newman, *Publishing Production Manager*
 John D. Painter, *Statistics Coordinator*
 Ronald Schwartz, *Director, Television News Service, 119 West 57th
Street, Suite 1212, New York, N.Y. 10019*
 Sean W. Straziscar, *Statistics Coordinator*
 J. Gregory Summers, *Assistant Director of Publishing*
 Cynthia M. Van Matre, *Assistant Director of Promotions*
 Vikki K. Watson, *Assistant Editor, The NCAA News*
 James F. Wright, *Statistics Services Manager*

######

Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania: Jennie H. Carpenter, Curtis R. English, Mary Gardner, Brian Johnson, Burton Reese
 Bluefield State College: John S. Duffy
 Boise State University: Gene Bleymaier, Carol Ladwig, Charles P. Ruch, Yvonne Sandmire
 Boston College: Mary Miller Carson, Chester S. Gladchuk, Lynn K. Holleran
 Bowdoin College: Sidney J. Watson
 Bowie State University: Charles A. Guilford, Nathanael Pollard Jr.
 Bowling Green State University: Calvin Bowers, Mary Ellen Cloninger, John C. Gregory, Ken Kavanagh, Marvin L. Kumler, Paul J. Olscamp
 Bradley University: John R. Brazil, Ron Ferguson, Ron Koperski
 Brandeis University: Barbara Bickford, Jeffrey W. Cohen
 Bridgewater College (Virginia): Mary Frances Heishman, Thomas M. Kinder
 Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts): Paul Dubois, John C. Harper
 Brigham Young University: Clayne R. Jensen, Barbara Day Lockhart, Pete Witbeck, Lu Wallace
 Brockport, State University College at: Linda J. Case, Edward Matejkovic, Ginny L. Studer
 Brown University: Beverly E. Ledbetter, Julie Riccardelli, David T. Roach, Joan W. Taylor
 Bryant College: Linda C. Hackett
 Bryn Mawr College: Lynne M. Kraskouskas, Jenepher P. Shillingford
 Bucknell University: Rick Hartzell, Barbara A. Shailor, Gary A. Sojka, Timothy W. Sweeney, Brad Tufts
 Buena Vista College: Mike Binder, Jim Hershberger
 Buffalo, State University College at: Fred J. Hartrick
 Buffalo, State University of New York at: Charles R. Fournier, Michael J. Gentile, William R. Greiner, Nelson E. Townsend, Emily R. Ward
 Butler University: Geoffrey Bannister, Jona Braden, Richard E. Martin, John C. Parry

 California, University of, Berkeley: Jack Citrin, Christine A. Dawson, Robert G. Driscoll
 California, University of, Davis: Pamela L. Gill-Fisher, Jerry M. Henderson, Keith R. Williams
 California, University of, Irvine: Daniel G. Guerrero, Petrina M. Long, Horace Mitchell, Lyman W. Porter
 California, University of, Los Angeles: Peter T. Dalis, Douglas S. Hobbs, Judith R. Holland, Charles E. Young
 California, University of, Riverside: Raymond L. Orbach, James J. Sims, Nancy Williams

California, University of, San Diego: Felicia Faro, Ken Grosse, Marilyn Hill, J. Michael Hipp, Judith M. Sweet, Ted White
 California, University of, Santa Barbara: Steven Allaback, Alice Henry, John V. Kasser, Jim Romeo
 California Institute of Technology: Daniel L. Bridges
 California Lutheran University: Robert Doering
 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: John F. McCutcheon, Marilyn McNeil, Michael J. Wenzl
 California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Gene Awakuni, Frank Gibbons, Karen L. Miller
 California State University, Bakersfield: Rudy Carvajal, George B. Hibbard, Brian McNamara
 California State University, Chico: Janet R. Kittell
 California State University, Dominguez Hills: Harold Charnofsky, Kay Don, Sam Lagana
 California State University, Fresno: Gary A. Cunningham, John Easterbrook, Lynn Hemink, Diane Milutinovich, Peter Simis, John D. Welty
 California State University, Fullerton: Judith A. Anderson, Leon Gilbert, Milton A. Gordon, Maryalyce Jeremiah, Bill Shumard
 California State University, Hayward: Kenneth Rebman, F. Douglas Weiss
 California State University, Los Angeles: Carol M. Dunn, Fleur Yano
 California State University, Northridge: Judith M. Brame, Robert J. Hiebert, Ray H. Pettit, Blenda J. Wilson
 California State University, Sacramento: Lee A. McElroy, Irene Shea, Rose Leigh Vines
 California State University, San Bernardino: Barry Knight, David L. Suenram
 California State University, Stanislaus: Joseph T. Donahue, Wayne Pierce
 California University of Pennsylvania: Thomas G. Pucci
 Calvin College: Beverly Klooster
 Cameron University: Jerry Hrniciar, Kim Vinson
 Campbell University: Susan A. Berner, Tom Collins, L. T. Easley, Norman A. Wiggins
 Canisius College: Denise LaRusch, Candalene J. McCombs, Thomas E. Miller, Daniel P. Starr
 Capital University: Armin P. Langholz, Roger Welsh
 Carleton College: Leon Lunder, Margie Mara
 Carnegie Mellon University: John H. Harvey, Joan E. Maser
 Carroll College (Wisconsin): Susan Hansen, Merle Masonholder
 Carson-Newman College: David W. Barger
 Carthage College: Robert Bonn, F. Gregory Campbell
 Case Western Reserve University: Nancy Gray, David M. Hutter, Glenn Nicholls
 Castleton State College: Natalie Hamilton
 Catawba College: Thomas H. Fletcher

Catholic University: Jone Dowd
 Centenary College (Louisiana): Harold Christensen
 Central Arkansas, University of: Bill E. Stephens, Winfred L. Thompson, Roy Whitehead Jr.
 Central College (Iowa): Marjorie B. Giles, Richard Kacmarynski, Kenneth J. Weller
 Central Connecticut State University: Robert F. Ariosto, Judith A. Davidson, Kim E. Hollins, Frank R. A. Resnick
 Central Florida, University of: William G. Callarman, John C. Hitt, Steve Sloan, Art W. Zeleznik
 Central Michigan University: James W. Damitio, David B. Keilitz, Leonard E. Plachta, Marcy Weston, Jason C. Wilkie
 Central Missouri State University: Ed Elliott, Paul H. Engelmann, Jerry M. Hughes, Crista Troester
 Central Oklahoma, University of: Jeff McKibbin, Paul E. Roach, John E. Wagnon
 Centre College: Michael F. Adams, Kitty R. Baird, Ray Hammond
 Chadron State College: Bradley R. Smith
 Chaminade University: Thomas Spring
 Chapman College: Penny Brush, David Currey, James Doti
 Charleston, College of (South Carolina): Jerry Baker, Otto German, William V. Moore
 Charleston Southern University: Howard Bagwell, Michael T. Hammond, Stephen D. Hudson, Jairy C. Hunter Jr., Bob Stevens
 Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: Andrew Hinson
 Chicago, University of: Starkey Duncan, Paul Moyer, Rosalie Resch, Lorna P. Straus, Thomas Weingartner
 Chicago State University: Albert Avant, Wendy S. Taylor
 Cincinnati, University of: Nancy R. Hamant, Vincent G. Ille, Cynthia Oxley, Charles F. "Rick" Taylor, George D. Wolterman
 Citadel, The: Walter Nadzak, Col. Gerald L. Runey, Lt. Gen. Claudius E. Watts III
 Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: John Zinda
 Clarion University of Pennsylvania: Robert Carlson, Nancy J. Latimore, Diane L. Reinhard
 Clark Atlanta University: Jean B. Chandler, Thomas W. Cole Jr., Richard Cosby, Philip L. Hood
 Clark University (Massachusetts): Linda S. Moulton
 Clarkson University: William O'Flaherty
 Clemson University: S. Paul Aaron, Cecil O. Huey Jr., Max Lennon, Dwight Rainey, Robert W. Robinson Jr., Linda White
 Cleveland State University: Alice J. Khol, John Konstantinos, Ronald G. Schultz, Claire Van Ummersen
 Coastal Carolina University: Jess Dannelly, Andy Hendrick
 Coe College: Barron Bremner
 Colby-Sawyer College: Debi Field McGrath
 Colgate University: Braden Houston, F. Scott Kraly, Janet A. Little, Mark H. Murphy, Martin Scarano

College Misericordia: Michael W. Mould
 Colorado, University of, Boulder: Judith E. N. Albino, James N. Corbridge Jr., Bill Marolt
 Colorado, University of, Colorado Springs: Theophilus D. Gregory, Linda Bunnell Jones
 Colorado Christian University: Stan Dyck, Linda Rush, Ronald R. Schmidt
 Colorado College: Susan Ashley, Roxanne Dale, Maxwell F. Taylor
 Colorado School of Mines: R. Bruce Allison, John A. Hogan
 Colorado State University: David Ames, G. James Francis, Marsha Smeltzer, Christine Susemihl, Richard P. Tusa
 Columbia University-Barnard College: Merry L. Ormsby, John A. Reeves
 Columbus College: Frank D. Brown
 Concordia College, Moorhead: Armin Pipho
 Connecticut, University of: John L. Allen, Pat Bobcock, Jeffrey A. Hathaway, Noreen Morris, Lewis Perkins, Michael Zito
 Connecticut College: Claire L. Gaudiani, Robert Malekoff, Anne Parmenter
 Coppin State College: Thomas Linton Jr., Clayton McNeill
 Cornell College: Ellen Whale
 Cornell University: Virginia Augusta, Brian Austin, Betsy East, Laing E. Kennedy
 Cortland, State University College at: Dolores A. Bogard, Lee Roberts, C. Jane Snell
 Creighton University: C. Timothy Dickel, Thomas N. Moore
 Dartmouth College: Jo Ann Harper, Richard G. Jaeger, Jo-Ann Nester
 Davidson College: M. Terrence Holland, John W. Kuykendall, J. B. Stroud
 Dayton, University of: R. Elaine Dreidame, Brother Raymond L. Fitz, Dennis Gerdeman, Ted Kissell
 Delaware, University of: John L. Burmeister, Mary Ann Hitchens, Edgar N. Johnson, David P. Roselle
 Delaware State College: William B. DeLauder, Tommy L. Frederick, John C. Martin
 Delaware Valley College: Frank Wolfgang
 Delta State University: Milton L. Bradley, Jim Jordan, Kent Wyatt
 Denison University: F. Trevor Gamble, Michele Tolela Myers, Larry Scheiderer
 Denver, University of: Jack McDonald, Daniel L. Ritchie, Terrence J. Toy, Diane T. Wendt, Sheila Phelan Wright
 DePaul University: William D. Bradshaw, James Doyle, Richard P. Farkas, Jean Lenti Ponsetto
 DePauw University: Robert G. Bottoms
 Detroit Mercy, University of: Joseph F. Clark, John Cochrane, Patricia Kellstrom, Brad Kinsman

Dickinson College: Leslie J. Poolman
 District of Columbia, University of: Emma J. Best, Alvin J. Darby,
 Dwight F. Datcher
 Drake University: Jean Berger, Lynn King, Susan E. Wright
 Drew University: Sally A. Dreyer, Vernon H. Mummert
 Drexel University: Johnson D. Bowie, Barbara Kilgour
 Drury College: Penny Clayton, Barbara Cowherd, Bruce Harger
 Dubuque, University of: Connie Bandy Hodge
 Duke University: Thomas A. Spragens Jr.
 Duquesne University: William P. Buzzi, Brian Colleary

Earlham College: Porter G. Miller
 East Carolina University: Charles L. Carr, Richard R. Eakin, Dave
 Hart Jr., Ernest W. Schwarz
 East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania: Earl W. Edwards,
 Roger Gill, Diane Husic, Carey J. Snyder
 East Tennessee State University: Charles E. Clark, Janice C. Shelton
 East Texas State University: Margaret Harbison, Donald A. Ingold,
 Jerry D. Morris
 Eastern Connecticut State University: Stephen Kenton, Roy H.
 Merolli, Sharlene A. Peter
 Eastern Illinois University: John M. Craft, David L. Jorns, Ron Paap,
 Robert E. Saltmarsh, Joan K. Schmidt
 Eastern Kentucky University: Robert J. Baugh, H. Hanly
 Funderburk Jr., Martha Mullins
 Eastern Mennonite College: Roger E. Mast
 Eastern Michigan University: John R. Adams, Carole J. Huston,
 William E. Shelton, Tim L. Weiser
 Eastern Montana College: Pete LeRoy, Gary Nelson, Ed Whipple
 Eastern New Mexico University: Thurman Elder, Chris C. Gage
 Eastern Washington University: Ken Dolan, John Johnson, Frank E.
 Nelson, Ron Raver
 Edinboro University of Pennsylvania: James K. McDonald, Jody
 Mooradian
 Elizabeth City State University: Edward McLean, William A. Porter
 Elizabethtown College: Tina Hill
 Elmhurst College: Christopher M. Ragsdale
 Elon College: Robert C. Hassard, Vicki Hightower, Alan J. White
 Emory University: Steven Batterson, Chuck Gordon, Sandy Tillman
 Emporia State University: Robert E. Glennen, Wilma Kasnic,
 William W. Quayle, John Rich
 Endicott College: Stephen L. Woodcock
 Erskine College: Wilbur H. Reames Jr.
 Evansville, University of: James A. Byers, Linda Crick, J. Robert
 Knott, James S. Vinson

Fairfield University: Joe Dennin, Tracey Flynn, Harold P.
 Menninger, William P. Schumpf

Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: Hallie Cohen, William T.
 Klika Jr.
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Roy Danforth, Ann Gulino,
 Richard Panicucci
 Fairmont State College: Colin T. Cameron
 Fayetteville State University: Ralph E. Burns, Clarence White Jr.
 Ferris State University: Narbeth R. Emmanuel, Tom Kirinovic, Mark
 Kosciuszko
 Ferrum College: Ted Kinder
 Fitchburg State College: Elizabeth A. Kruczek
 Florida, University of: Nicholas J. Cassisi, Jeremy Foley, Ann Marie
 Lawler, E. James McCloskey, Greg McGarity
 Florida A&M University: Cynthia DuPont-Jones, Frederick S.
 Humphries, Walter Reed, Ken Riley
 Florida Atlantic University: Anthony James Catanese, Thomas W.
 Scott
 Florida Institute of Technology: William K. Jurgens
 Florida International University: Theodore A. Aceto, Richard J.
 Correnti, Joyce Elam, Mary Alice Manella
 Florida Southern College: Hal Smeltzly, Lois Webb
 Florida State University: Charles W. Ehrhardt, Robert Goin, Rosalyn
 B. Greene, Brian Mand, Charles B. Reed, R. E. Sofer
 Fordham University: Francis X. McLaughlin
 Fort Hays State University: Gerry Cox, Edward H. Hammond,
 Thomas E. Spicer
 Fort Lewis College: Bruce A. Grimes, Joel M. Jones
 Fort Valley State College: Douglas T. Porter, Oscar L. Prater
 Framingham State College: Lawrence P. Boyd
 Francis Marion College: Gerald Griffin, Thomas C. Stanton
 Franklin and Marshall College: John Andrew, Patricia W. Epps,
 William A. Marshall
 Franklin College: Thomas R. Hodge
 Franklin Pierce College: Richard L. Burns, Bruce Kirsch
 Fredonia, State University College at: Everett J. Phillips, Thomas E.
 Prevet
 Frostburg State College: Loyal K. Park
 Furman University: John M. Block, John Burns, Ray Parlier
 Gallaudet University: Peg Worthington
 Gannon University: Howard Elwell, Charles M. Murphy
 Gardner-Webb College: F. Osborne McFarland, Jeff Tubbs
 Geneseo, State University College at: William Caren, John L. Spring
 George Mason University: Susan A. Collins, Michael G. Emsley, Jack
 E. Kvanetz
 George Washington University: Steve Bilsky, Edward A. Caress,
 Robert A. Chernak, Susie Jones, Mary Jo Warner
 Georgetown University: Adam Brick, Wayne A. Knoll, Francis X.
 Rienzo, Patricia Thomas

Georgia, University of: Gary Couvillon, Vincent J. Dooley, Lee R. Hayley, Charles B. Knapp, Elizabeth Murphey, William M. Powell, Hoke Wilder

Georgia College: Stan Aldridge, Edwin G. Speir Jr.

Georgia Institute of Technology: John P. Crecine, Michael W. Edwards, Bernadette V. McGlade, James E. Murphy III, George Nemhauser, Homer C. Rice, William M. Sangster

Georgia Southern College: Brenda S. Carter, Harry S. Carter, Nicholas L. Henry, Hank Schomber, G. Lane Van Tassell, David B. Wagner

Georgia State University: Blaine Hughes, James H. Maxey, Orby Moss Jr., Carl V. Patton

Gettysburg College: Charles W. Winters

Glenville State College: Steven B. Creasey, Kenneth W. Osborne

Gonzaga University: John J. Preston

Gordon College: Walter Bowman, Brendan Cooney

Goucher College: William J. Kaiser

Grambling State University: A. Lane Howell, Harold W. Lundy

Grand Canyon University: B. Keith Baker

Grand Valley State University: Joan Boand, Mary L. Horan, Michael J. Kovalchik, Arend D. Lubbers

Greensboro College: Kim A. Strable

Grinnell College: Diane Fairchild

Grove City College: R. Jack Behringer

Guilford College: Gayle Currie, Laura Klingseisen

Gustavus Adolphus College: James M. Malmquist

Hamilton College: Geraldine Knortz

Hampden-Sydney College: Joe Bush

Hampton University: Ollie M. Bowman, Dennis Thomas

Hanover College: Richard Naylor, Stanley M. Totten

Hartford, University of: Denise Cohen, Jane Horvath, Patricia H. Meiser-McKnett

Hartwick College: Kenneth Kutler

Harvard University: William J. Cleary Jr., Patricia Henry, Marcella K. Zalot

Haverford College: Penelope C. Hinckley, Gregory Kannerstein, Matthew Leighninger

Hawaii, University of, at Hilo: William R. Trumbo

Hawaii, University of, Honolulu: Brandi Brooks, James J. Donovan,

Kaia Hedlund, Stephen L. Martin, Hugh Yoshida

Heidelberg College: Martin Reno

Henderson State University: Charles D. Dunn, David Gardner

Hendrix College: Ann H. Die

Hillsdale College: Mickey Craig, Jack H. McAvoy

Hobart and William Smith Colleges: Connee Zotos

Hofstra University: James V. Garvey, Cindy Lewis

Hollins College: Lynda J. Calkins

Holy Cross College: George Blaney, Rev. John E. Brooks, Ronald S. Perry, Ann Zelesky

Hope College: Raymond E. Smith

Houston, University of: James R. Benbrook, William C. Carr, Diane Howell, Bill McGillis, James H. Pickering

Howard University: Steve Favors, Deborah K. Johnson, Sondra Norrell-Thomas, David C. Simmons, A. B. Williamson

Humboldt State University: Gail J. Fults, Dennis L. Geyer, Charles N. Lindemann

Hunter College: Terry A. Wansart

Idaho, University of: Kathy Clark, W. Harold Godwin, Pete Liske, Elisabeth Zinser

Idaho State University: Ken Bothof, Richard L. Bowen, Nancy Graziano, Randy Hoffman, Cornelius A. Hofman

Illinois, University of, Champaign: Michael Aiken, Mildred B. Griggs, Ronald E. Guenther, Karol A. Kahrs, Richard F. Wilson

Illinois, University of, Chicago: Thomas F. Russo, James W. Schmidt, Barbara S. Wood

Illinois Benedictine College: Anthony L. LaScala

Illinois College: William A. Anderson

Illinois State University: Richard Greenspan, Albert Otto, Donna Taylor, Beth Verner, Thomas P. Wallace

Illinois Wesleyan University: Barbara Cothren

Indiana State University: C. Sue Davis, Paul Edgerton, Brian D. Faison, John C. Jessell, John W. Moore, Andrea Myers

Indiana University, Bloomington: Clarence H. Doninger, Isabella Hutchison, Haydn H. Murray, Mary Ann Rohleder

Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Frank Cignetti, Steven C. Ender, Lawrence K. Pettit, Erika Renwick, John C. Thomas

Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne: Robert A. Barrett, Walt Branson

Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis: William Kulrsrud, Hugh Wolf

Indianapolis, University of: Kenneth D. Borden, William A. Bright, David Huffman, G. Benjamin Lantz Jr.

Iona College: Rich Petriccione

Iowa, University of: Robert Bowsby, Christine H. B. Grant, Carol A. Gruber, W. Fred Mims, Hunter R. Rawlings III, Bonnie Slatton

Iowa State University: Norman L. Boyles, J. Elaine Hieber, Martin C. Jischke, Eugene D. Smith

Ithaca College: Robert C. Deming, Kristen M. Ford, Irene Gomberg, Bonnie J. Gordon, Thomas C. Longin, David C. Maley, Francine Montemurro, Peter Moore, Peter Vaughn, James J. Whalen

Jackson State University: Paul E. Covington, Melvin I. Evans, W. C. Gorden, Dennis Hollway Jr., James E. Lyons, Sadie E. Magee

Jacksonville State University: Jerry N. Cole, James Hobbs, Harold J. McGee

Jacksonville University: James J. Brady, Thomas M. Seitz

James Madison University: Brad Babcock, O. Dean Ehlers, Donald Lemish, Janet D. Lucas, Dennis E. Robison

Jersey City State College: Lawrence R. Schiner

John Carroll University: W. D. Bookwalter, Tony DeCarlo

John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Susan Larkin

Johns Hopkins University: Thomas P. Calder, Robert H. Scott

Johnson C. Smith University: Phyllis Worthy Dawkins, Horace T. Small

Juniata College: William F. Berrier

Kalamazoo College: Marilyn A. Maurer

Kansas, University of: Robert E. Frederick, Richard Konzem, Delbert M. Shankel, Betsy G. Stephenson

Kansas State University: Jim Epps, Patti Hagemeyer, Robert S. Krause, Robert R. Snell, Max F. Urlick

Kean College: Patricia Hannisch, Glenn Hedden

Keene State College: Mary V. Conway

Kennesaw State College: Dave Waples

Kent State University: Paul V. Amodio, Judy Devine, William Konnert

Kentucky, University of: Virginia A. Atwood, Sandra D. Bell, John Cropp, Kathleen J. DeBoer, Charles T. Wethington Jr.

Kentucky State University: Herbert L. Davis Jr., Betty M. Gibson, Donald W. Lyons, Cassie Osborne Jr.

Kentucky Wesleyan College: James E. Welch

Kenyon College: Robert D. Bunnell

King's College: John J. Dorish

Knox College: Harlan Knosher

Kutztown University of Pennsylvania: David McFarland, Clark Yeager

La Salle University: Brother Joseph F. Burke, Kathleen M. McNally, Robert Mullen, Annette O'Connor

La Verne, University of: Jimmy M. Paschal, Rick Simon

Lafayette College: Herman C. Kissiah, Bruce E. McCutcheon

Lake Forest College: Jackie A. Slaats

Lake Superior State University: William Crawford, Jack Jackson, Charles W. Jones

Lamar University: Rex L. Cottle, Michael E. O'Brien, Larry W. Spradley

Lander College: Betty H. Williams

Le Moyne College: Richard W. Rockwell

Lebanon Valley College: Louis A. Sorrentino, Kathleen Tierney

Lehigh University: Karen Adams, Peter Likins, Joseph D. Sterrett, David A. Van Horn

Lehman College: Kevin T. McGinniss

Lewis University: Raphael Mascari, Paul Ruddy

Liberty University: Chuck Burch, A. Pierre Guillermin, Mike Hall

Lincoln Memorial University: Earl D. Brooks II, Scott D. Miller

Lincoln University (Missouri): Lucius Jones, Leo E. Lewis, Mary Beth Ochsner, David L. Shinholster

Livingston University: Billy B. Slay, Louis R. Smith Jr.

Livingstone College: Robert O'Neal

Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania: Tien Lu Chu, Sharon E. Taylor, Craig D. Willis

Long Beach State University: Karl Anatol, David Bernstein, Dixie A. Grimmett, Cindy Masner, David P. O'Brien

Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus: Margaret Alaimo, Bernard W. Sullivan

Long Island University/C. W. Post Campus: Vincent Salamone

Longwood College: William F. Dorrill, Emily H. Harsh, Wayne McWee

Loras College: Robert G. Bieri

Louisiana State University: David Bahnsen, Pat Culbertson, William E. Davis, Joe Dean

Louisiana Tech University: Jerry W. Andrews, Jerry L. Stovall

Louisville, University of: Glynda Burton, William C. Olsen, Arthur M. Riehl, Donald C. Swain

Loyola College (Maryland): Diane M. Aikens, Joseph Boylan, James Smith

Loyola Marymount University: Elena Bove, Brian Quinn

Loyola University (Illinois): Carolyn V. O'Connell, Samuel P. Ramenofsky, Charles T. Schwarz

Luther College: Andrea S. Wickerham

Lynchburg College: Jack M. Toms, Charles O. Warren

Macalester College: Kenneth W. Andrews

MacMurray College: Edward J. Mitchell

Maine, University of: Linwood Carville, George L. Jacobson, Anne McCoy, Michael A. Ploszek

Manchester College: Tom Jarman

Manhattan College: Robert J. Byrnes, E. Joseph Lee, Brother Thomas J. Scanlan

Manhattanville College: Theodore H. Kolva Jr.

Mankato State University: Georgene Brock, Ronald L. Hybertson, Richard R. Rush

Mansfield University of Pennsylvania: Rodney C. Kelchner, Roger N. Maisner

Marist College: Eugene Doris, John Ritschdorff, Alison Sexton

Maritime College, State University of New York: James Migli

Marquette University: William L. Cords, Rev. Albert J. DiUlio, Carla H. Hay, Tat Shiel

Mars Hill College: Ed Hoffmeyer

Marshall University: Jack Daniels, William Lee Moon Sr., Dave Schnase
 Mary Baldwin College: Mary Ann Kasselmann
 Maryland, University of, Baltimore County: Charles R. Brown, Freeman Hrabowski, Susan Kitchen, John Kloetzel, Kathleen G. Zerrlaut
 Maryland, University of, College Park: Ferdinand A. Geiger, Joan S. Hult, William E. Kirwan, Betty F. Smith, Suzanne Tyler
 Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Henry M. Brooks, Hallie E. Gregory
 Maryville University of St. Louis: Keith Lovin, David R. Pierce
 Marywood College: Jane Farr, Mary Jo Cuning
 Massachusetts, University of, Amherst: Howard M. Davis, Michael Hooker, Robert K. Marcum, Elaine Sortino, Elizabeth Tuthill, Glenn M. Wong
 Massachusetts, University of, Boston: Mary R. Barrett
 Massachusetts, University of, Dartmouth: Peter H. Cressy, Robert A. Dowd, Judith A. Sullivan
 Massachusetts, University of, at Lowell: R. Wayne Edwards, Linda H. Kistler
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Richard A. Hill, Candace Royer
 Massachusetts Maritime Academy: Robert Corradi
 McNeese State University: Tommy E. Bogle, Robert G. Hayes, Robert D. Hebert, Ron LeLeux
 Medgar Evers College: Roy Anderson
 Memphis State University: Charles Cavagnaro, Lynn Parkes, V. Lane Rawlins, Timothy L. Sumner, Nicholas L. White
 Mercer University: R. Kirby Godsey, Benjamin S. Kelley, Bobby Pope
 Mercyhurst College: Peter J. Russo
 Merrimack College: Robert M. DeGregorio Jr., Joseph T. Kelley
 Mesa State College: James F. Paronto
 Messiah College: Layton Shoemaker
 Metropolitan State College of Denver: William Helman
 Miami, University of (Florida): Paul Dee, Kelly L. Landry, Lawrence G. Wahl
 Miami University (Ohio): Harold W. Jasper, R. C. Johnson, Paul G. Risser, Karen Womack
 Michigan, University of: Percy Bates, Margaret J. Bradley-Doppes, Philip Hughes, Craig Keilitz, Joe Roberson
 Michigan State University: Merrily Dean Baker, Michael L. Kasavana, Kathy Lindahl, Clarence Underwood Jr.
 Michigan Technological University: Darrell W. Smith, Curtis J. Tompkins, J. Richard Yeo
 Middle Tennessee State University: Race P. Bergman, John E. Stanford, Wendy Thompson, James E. Walker
 Middlebury College: G. Thomas Lawson

Millersville University of Pennsylvania: Gene A. Carpenter, Mary Ann Gray-Schlegel, Gary Reighard, Marjorie A. Trout
 Millikin University: Harriett Crannell
 Mills College: Helen Carroll
 Millsaps College: George M. Harmon, Ron Jurney
 Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Gregory Fox, Linda Larson, Bruce M. McLeod, Patricia A. Merrier
 Minnesota, University of, Morris: Mark Fohl
 Minnesota, University of, Twin Cities: McKinley Boston, Mark Dienhart, Jeff Schemmel, Mariah Snyder, Robert A. Stein, Chris Voelz
 Mississippi, University of: Warner Alford, Kathryn R. Strickland, R. Gerald Turner, David K. Wells, Max W. Williams, Les Wyatt
 Mississippi College: Rory Lee, Terry McMillan, Sid Moller
 Mississippi State University: David C. Boles, Duncan McKenzie, Walter B. Newsom, Larry O. Templeton
 Mississippi University for Women: Jo Spearman
 Mississippi Valley State University: Charles Prophet, William W. Sutton
 Missouri, University of, Columbia: Joe Castiglione, Dan Devine, Charles A. Kiesler, Sarah K. Reesman, Carl Settergren
 Missouri, University of, Kansas City: J. Joseph Doerr, Ed Grom, Eleanor Brantley Schwartz
 Missouri, University of, Rolla: Lawrence O. Christensen, Mark E. Mullin, John T. Park
 Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Richard R. Meckfessel, Thomas R. Schnell, Denise Silvester, Charles G. Smith
 Missouri Southern State College: Sallie Beard, Glenn Dolence, Wayne A. Harrell
 Missouri Western State College: James W. Grechus, Ed B. Harris, Mary Margaret Nichols
 Monmouth College (New Jersey): Joan Martin, Marilyn A. Parker, Jeffrey Stapleton
 Montana, University of: George M. Dennison, Robert Lindsay, William Moos, Kathy Noble
 Montana State University: Douglas B. Fullerton, Susan M. Jacobson, Michael P. Malone, Robert G. Oakberg
 Montclair State College: Holly P. Gera, Gregory L. Lockard
 Moorhead State University: Roland Dille, Katy Wilson
 Moravian College: Roger H. Martin
 Morehead State University: W. Michael Brown, Ronald G. Eaglin, Steve Hamilton, Mike Mincey
 Morehouse College: Willie G. Shaw
 Morgan State University: Arlise Cooper, Kenneth McBryde
 Morningside College: Jerry Israel, Joan McDermott, Sharon Ocker
 Morris Brown College: Johnnie D. Myers, Greg Thompson
 Mount Holyoke College: Cathy Buchanan, Laurie Priest

Mount St. Mary's College (Maryland): J. Thomas Balistrere, John N. Loughran, Robert Pastoor
 Mount Union College: Truman Turnquist
 Muhlenberg College: Ralph Kirchenheiter
 Murray State University: Ronald J. Kurth, Margaret Simmons, Michael D. Strickland

Nazareth College (New York): William H. Carey
 Nebraska, University of, at Kearney: Dick Beechner, Gladys Styles Johnston
 Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: James Bandy, Don Bryant, Bill Byrne, Barbara A. Hibner, James O'Hanlon, Al Papik, Graham Spanier
 Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Connie J. Claussen, Robert B. Flynn, Robert F. Gibson
 Nebraska Wesleyan University: Mary Beth Kennedy, Christy Wilson
 Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Paul E. Burns, David Chambers, Kelly Groddy, Lisa A. Kelleher, Robert C. Maxson, Jim Weaver
 Nevada, University of, Reno: Chris Ault, Joseph N. Crowley, Christopher H. Exline, Keith L. Lee, Angela D. Taylor
 New Hampshire, University of: John H. Lawson, David O'Connor, Judith L. Ray
 New Hampshire College: Joseph R. Polak
 New Haven, University of: Deborah Chin
 New Jersey Institute of Technology: James Catalano
 New Mexico, University of: Conrad Colbert, Rudy Davalos, Robert J. Desiderio, Linda K. Estes, Chris McGrew, Richard E. Peck
 New Mexico Highlands University: Robert N. Evers
 New Mexico State University: Karen Fey, James T. Fisher, Albert T. Gonzales, James E. Halligan
 New Orleans, University of: Sybil A. Boudreaux, Ronald J. Maestri, Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien, Donald A. Pekarek
 New Paltz, State University College at: Alice Chandler, James A. Zalacca
 New Rochelle, College of: Kathleen LeVache
 New York, City College of: Paul E. Bobb
 New York Institute of Technology: Clyde Doughty Jr.
 New York University: Jack E. Peckett, Daniel E. Quilty
 Newberry College: Jack Williams
 Niagara University: Barbara A. Green, Michael L. Jankowski
 Nicholls State University: Donald Ayo, Cathy Compton, Mike Knight, Lance J. Poimboeuf
 Nichols College: Thomas R. Cafaro
 Norfolk State University: William L. Price, Delanyard Robinson, P. LaVerne Sweat
 North Adams State College: Joseph Zavattaro
 North Alabama, University of: Bill Jones, Robert L. Potts, Robert D. Young

North Carolina, University of, Asheville: Dede M. Allen, Tom Hunnicutt, Eric Iovacchini, Robert D. Yearout
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Richard A. Baddour, Paul Hardin, Richard G. Hiskey, Beth Miller, John D. Swofford
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: David Goldfield, Kim Green, Judy W. Rose, James H. Woodward
 North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: James H. Allen, Nelson E. Bobb, Harold G. Hall, David B. Knight, William E. Moran, Tony R. Winkler, James R. Wyatt
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: Pat Howey, Paul A. Miller
 North Carolina A&T State University: Dorothy J. Alston, Willie J. Burden, Edward B. Fort, James A. Williams Jr.
 North Carolina Central University: Les Brinson, Carey Hughley, Sandra Shuler
 North Carolina State University: Arthur W. Cooper, Nora Lynn Finch, Eric Hyman, James D. Miller, Larry K. Monteith, William T. "Todd" Turner
 North Carolina Wesleyan College: C. Michael Fox
 North Central College: Walter J. Johnson
 North Dakota, University of: Kendall L. Baker, Kathleen McCann, George W. Schubert, Terry Wanless
 North Dakota State University: Lynn Dorn, Robert Entzion, Allan G. Fischer, Jim L. Ozburn, Dan Summy
 North Florida, University of: Henry J. Camp, Adam W. Herbert, John C. Ratliff
 North Park College: Jerry Chaplin, David Horner
 North Texas, University of: Craig Helwig, Alfred F. Hurley, John Thornton, George C. Young
 Northeast Louisiana University: Maynard M. Dolecheck, Benny Hollis, Lawson L. Swearingen Jr.
 Northeast Missouri State University: Lacy Lee Baker, Alan R. Graham, Walter H. Ryle
 Northeastern Illinois University: Vivian L. Fuller, Lynn Gaziano
 Northeastern University: Kristin L. Burns, Irwin M. Cohen, Barry Gallup, Richard Lapchick, Robert P. Lyons, Robert W. McCabe, Erik L. Nedeau
 Northern Arizona University: Tom Jurich, Sam F. McClanahan, Patsy B. Reed, Kelly Woodward
 Northern Colorado, University of: James Fallis, Robert L. Heiny
 Northern Illinois University: Robert Brigham, Robert Collins, Ray Dembinski, Cary Groth, John E. La Tourette, Gerald K. O'Dell, Jim Schaus
 Northern Iowa, University of: John E. Conner, Christopher Ritrievi, Jack D. Wilkinson, Sandra C. Williamson
 Northern Kentucky University: Thomas J. Kearns, Jane Meier
 Northern Michigan University: Richard B. Comley, Harold Dorf, Anne Goodman James, John Ludlow, R. Thomas Peters Jr.

Northern State University: Patricia Fors, William Haigh, James Kretchman
 Northwest Missouri State University: Virgil Albertini, Dean L. Hubbard, James C. Redd, Sherri Reeves
 Northwestern State University: Robert A. Alost, Greg Harrod, Tynes Hildebrand, Glen Krupica, Jerry Pierce, Craig Rex
 Northwestern University: Frederick Hemke, Ken Kraft, Betsy J. Mosher
 Northwood University: David W. Coffey
 Norwich University: Anthony A. Mariano
 Notre Dame, College of (California): Virginia Babel
 Notre Dame, College of (Maryland): Donna M. Ledwin
 Notre Dame, University of: Brian M. Boulac, Melissa L. Conboy, Bubba Cunningham, Michael J. Karwoski, Joe O'Brien, Richard A. Rosenthal

 Oakland University: Paul E. Hartman, Glenn A. Jackson
 Oberlin College: George Andrews, James E. Foels, Patrice A. Milkovich
 Occidental College: Ralph L. Amey, Dale V. Widolff
 Ohio Northern University: Gale E. Daugherty
 Ohio State University: Phyllis J. Bailey, James L. Jones, Carol W. Kennedy, Bill Myles, David Williams II
 Ohio University: Mary C. Keifer, Scott Marsh, Harold N. McElhaney, James Martin O'Connor, Peggy J. Pruitt, Jessie C. Robertson Jr.
 Ohio Wesleyan University: Justin Kronewetter
 Oklahoma, University of: Donnie Duncan, Daniel G. Gibbens, Lawrence E. Naifeh, Richard L. Van Horn
 Oklahoma State University: Ann Baer, Ray M. Bowen, Robert A. Burton, Gerald M. Lage, David Martin, Marty Sargent
 Old Dominion University: Mikki Flowers, James Jarrett, James V. Koch, Janis Sanchez
 Old Westbury, State University College at: Theodora Ierides
 Olivet College: Jackie Shimp
 Oneonta, State University College at: James F. Baker, Albert H. Sosa
 Oral Roberts University: Robert T. Brooks
 Oregon, University of: Mimi Goldman, Gary Gray, James M. O'Fallon, Barbara Walker
 Oregon State University: Dutch Baughman, Michael Beachley, John V. Byrne, Patricia M. Drapela, Robert J. Frank
 Oswego, State University College at: Sandra L. Moore
 Otterbein College: Marilyn E. Day

 Pace University: Christopher Bledsoe, Ramona Polvere
 Pacific (California), University of the: Donald W. Bryan, Bob Lee
 Paine College: Ronnie O. Spry
 Parks College of St. Louis University: Gerald D. Kurfman
 Pembroke State University: Joseph B. Oxendine, Ray Pennington

Pennsylvania, University of: D. Elton Cochran-Fikes, Carolyn Schlie Femovich, Paul R. Rubincam Jr., Kenneth L. Shropshire
 Pennsylvania State University: Elizabeth Fahey Albright, John Bove, John J. Coyle, Tim Curley, Joseph V. Paterno, Ellen L. Perry
 Pennsylvania State University-Behrend College: John N. Grode, Herbert J. Lauffer, John M. Lilley
 Pepperdine University: Roxanne K. Levenson, Wayne Wright
 Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: Thomas R. Shirley Jr.
 Pittsburg State University: Ellen Carter, George Graham, William O. Samuels, Donald W. Wilson
 Pittsburgh, University of: John O. Bolvin, L. Oval Jaynes, Donna San't, Carol J. Sprague
 Plattsburgh, State University of New York at: Eldridge W. Roark Jr.
 Plymouth State College: Stephen R. Bamford
 Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Curtis W. Tong
 Portland, University of: Joseph A. Etzel
 Portland State University: Robert Lockwood, Randy Nordlof, Judith A. Ramaley
 Prairie View A&M University: Ronald D. Beard, Juhus W. Becton Jr., Barbara Jackel, Mary V. White
 Presbyterian College: Calhoun F. Gault, Kenneth B. Orr, Thomas A. Stallworth
 Princeton University: Amy Campbell, Leila Graham-Willis, Robert J. Myslik, George H. VanderZwaag
 Providence College: John M. Marinatto, Patricia D. Nichol
 Purdue University: Steven C. Beering, Morgan Burke, Martha O. Chiscon, Joni Comstock, Philip E. Nelson

 Quinnipiac College: Burt Kahn

 Radford University: Greig Denny, Charles L. Hayes, Chuck Taylor, Kevin T. Williams
 Ramapo College: Catherine M. Collins
 Randolph-Macon College: Jeff Burns, Helmut Werner
 Redlands, University of: Christopher N. Walker, Greg Warzecka
 Regis College (Massachusetts): Judith W. Burling
 Regis University (Colorado): Tom Dedin, Barbara Schroeder
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte, Kerry Quinn
 Rhode Island, University of: Anthony Adams, Lauren E. Anderson, Donald E. McCreight, Ronald J. Petro
 Rhode Island College: Gail H. Davis
 Rhodes College: Mike Clary
 Rice University: James A. Castaneda, Alan J. Chapman, Malcolm Gillis, Martha E. Hawthorne, John R. May, Steven Moniaci, Thomas Jesse Wilde
 Richard Stockton College of New Jersey: Susan Newcomb
 Richmond, University of: Harold W. Babb, Charles S. Boone, Ruth Goehring

Rider College: Curtis W. Blake, Chet Dalgewicz, Joseph M. Gowaskie,
J. Barton Luedeke, Viola H. Udy
Ripon College: Michele A. Wittler
Roanoke College: M. Scott Allison
Robert Morris College: Frank Burdine, Robert D. McBee, Edward A.
Nicholson, Robert W. Norberg, Tom Olson
Rochester, University of: Jeffrey Vennell, Joyce Wong
Roger Williams College: William M. Baird
Rollins College: Edward Borsoi, J. Philip Roach
Rowan College of New Jersey: Ted Kershner, Edward Streb
Rust College: Ishmell Edwards
Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Frederick E. Gruninger, Francis
L. Lawrence, Malcolm G. McLaren, Rita Kay Thomas, Joe
Whiteside
Rutgers University, Newark: John K. Adams, Florence A. Labenski

Sacred Heart University: Jim Barquinero, C. Donald Cook, Elizabeth
Luckie, Timothy P. Nash, Dan A. Pannese
Saginaw Valley State University: Robert T. Becker, Claudette
Charney, George W. Eastland Jr.
St. Anselm College: Theodore S. Paulauskas
St. Augustine's College: Wanzo F. Hendrix
St. Benedict, College of: Carol Howe-Veenstra, Lu Ann Reif
St. Bonaventure University: Barbara Hick, Thomas J. O'Connor
St. Cloud State University: Robert O. Bess, Arthur F. Grachek,
Morris Kurtz, Gladys Ziemer
St. Francis College (New York): James G. Thompson
St. Francis College (Pennsylvania): Bruce Elwell, Rev. Christian
Oravec, Frank Pergolizzi, Deborah M. Polca
St. John's University (Minnesota): James T. Murphy
St. John's University (New York): George R. Bisacca, John W. Kaiser,
Richard J. Krempecki, Kathleen Meehan, Michael A. Pisano
St. Joseph's College (Indiana): Fred Berger
St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania): Don J. DiJulia
St. Lawrence University: Thomas E. Bambrey, John A. Clark,
Dorothy Hall
St. Louis University: Lori A. Flanagan, Michael J. Ross, Deborah A.
Yow
St. Mary's College (California): Richard Mazzuto, William McLeod
St. Mary's College (Indiana): Jan Travis
St. Mary's College (Minnesota): Linda Anderson
St. Mary's College of Maryland: Joseph Gardiner
St. Michael's College: Edward P. Markey
St. Norbert College: Larry Van Alstine
St. Olaf College: Chris Daymont, James Dimick
St. Paul's College: Sunday A. Adesuyi, Harold L. Williams
St. Peter's College: Kim E. Culligan, William A. Stein
St. Rose, College of: Catherine C. Haker

St. Scholastica, College of: Kevin C. Snyder
St. Thomas, University of (Minnesota): Jo Ann Andregg
Salem State College: John D. Galaris
Salem-Teikyo University: Lou Talerico
Salisbury State University: Michael P. Vienna
Salve Regina University: Lynn Sheedy
Sam Houston State University: Martin J. Anisman, Ronnie Choate,
Tom Davis, Bobby K. Marks
Samford University: Stephen C. Allgood, Thomas E. Corts
San Diego, University of: Thomas Innacone, Regina Sullivan
San Diego State University: Reginald Blaylock, Ernst Griffin, Jayne
Hancock, James G. Malik, Fred L. Miller
San Francisco, University of: Sandee L. Hill, William J. Hogan, Erik
Visser
San Francisco State University: Kathy Argo, William E. Partlow,
Patty Rogers
San Jose State University: Thomas Brennan, Daniel R. Buerger,
Carolyn M. Lewis, Charles Whitcomb
Santa Clara University: James Briggs, Amy E. Hackett, Carroll M.
Williams
Savannah College of Art and Design: Matt Newman, Karen A. Ryan
Savannah State College: Charles J. Elmore
Scranton, University of: Gary N. Wodder
Seattle Pacific University: Wesley Lingren, Keith R. Phillips
Seton Hall University: George P. Browne, Laurence C. Keating Jr.,
Sue Regan
Shaw University: Dianthia M. Ford, Ernest L. Pickens, Keith Smith
Shepherd College: Katie Begole
Siena College: John D'Argenio, Joyce A. Legere, Terry J. Reynolds
Simmons College: Sheila Brown
Simpson College: John F. Sirianni
Skidmore College: Tim Brown
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania: Robertha Abney, William
C. Lennox
Smith College: Lynn Oberbillig
Sonoma State University: Ralph Barkey
South, University of: Mary Susan Cushman, Willard Huyck
South Alabama, University of: Joe Gottfried, George Smith, Sam
Strada, Hal Williams
South Carolina, University of, at Aiken: Robert E. Alexander,
Douglas R. Warrick
South Carolina, University of, Columbia: Laurie Massa, Michael B.
McGee, John M. Palms, Sandra L. Robinson
South Carolina, University of, at Spartanburg: Sterling R. Brown,
Daniel Codespoti, William J. Whitener
South Carolina State University: Leroy Davis, Barbara R. Hatton
South Dakota, University of: Betty Turner Asher, Jack F. Doyle, John
M. Hilpert, George R. Horner, Mary Mock

South Dakota State University: Mylo A. Hellickson, Jim Martin, Fred M. Oien, Robert T. Wagner
 South Florida, University of: Paul S. Griffin, Stewart W. Schneller
 Barbara Sparks-McGlinchy
 Southeast Missouri State University: Joseph H. Low Jr., Richard A. McDuffie, Kala M. Stroup
 Southeastern Louisiana University: Bob Butler, Tom Duple
 Southern California, University of: Jim Dennis, Mike Garrett Lisa Love, Noel Ragsdale
 Southern Colorado, University of: Patrick Bottini, Dan DeRose, Robert C. Shirley, Tony Taibi
 Southern Connecticut State University: Lawrence E. Fitzgerald, Nancy H. Lyons, Anthony Martone, Darryl Rogers
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: John J. Cody, James Hart, Margaret Matthias, Charlotte West
 Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Bradley L. Hewitt, Cynthia Jones
 Southern Indiana, University of: Donald D. Bennett, Charles J. Bertram
 Southern Maine, University of: Albert D. Bean, Remo H. Riciputi
 Southern Methodist University: Forrest Gregg, Charles Howard, A. Kenneth Pye, C. Paul Rogers III
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Ralph N. Floyd Jr., Helen Grant, Aubrey K. Lucas, Ronald G. Marquardt, H. C. McLellan, Noble Morton, Taylor Morton
 Southern University, Baton Rouge: Marino H. Casem, Robert H. Cobbins, Moses Keith Dupre, Thonius Tobinson Jr., Marvin L. Yates
 Southern Utah University: Kathryn Berg, Jack Bishop, David R. Braegger, Michael Richards
 Southwest Baptist University: David L. Brown, John A. Bryant, Stephanie Miller
 Southwest Missouri State University: Larry L. George, Bill O'Neill, Gregory P. Onstot, Bill Rowe, Mary Jo Wynn
 Southwest State University: Gary Carney
 Southwest Texas State University: Michael Abbott, Paul Bradshaw, Dana L. Craft, Ross Hamilton, Richard Hannan, Jerome H. Supple
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Ray P. Authement, Gerard L. St. Martin, Nelson J. Schexnayder Jr.
 Southwestern University (Texas): Sherri Babcock, Carla Lowry, Glada Munt, Roy B. Shilling Jr.
 Springfield College: Edward Bilik, Scott Nichols, Pamela Wustrow
 Stanford University: Susan Simoni Burk, Edward Leland, Cheryl L. Levick, Jerry I. Porras
 Staten Island, College of: Joseph Barresi
 Stephen F. Austin State University: Matt Fenley, Darren Fort, Steve McCarty, Baker Pattillo
 Stetson University: Robert J. Jacoby, Elizabeth J. Schumaker

Stony Brook, State University of New York at: Paul J. Dudzick, Thomas Kerth, Richard F. Laskowski, Sandra R. Weeden
 Suffolk University: James E. Nelson
 Susquehanna University: Connie Harnum, Donald Harnum
 Swarthmore College: Robert E. Williams
 Syracuse University: David H. Bennett, John J. Crouthamel, John P. Hardt, Kenneth A. Shaw, Doris R. Soladay

Tampa, University of: Hindman Wall
 Temple University: James M. Brown, JoAnne A. Epps, Thomas Marino, Joseph W. Marshall, Bonnie L. Parkhouse, James S. White, Michelle O. Willis
 Tennessee, University of, at Chattanooga: Edward G. Farrell, Michael H. Jones, Todd Markel, Frederick W. Obear
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Carl W. Asp, Joan C. Cronan, Douglas A. Dickey, Joseph E. Johnson, Malcolm C. McInnis Jr., William T. Snyder, Donna C. Thomas
 Tennessee, University of, at Martin: Ernest W. Blythe Jr., Margaret N. Perry
 Tennessee State University: Lula S. Collier, Bernard G. Crowell, James A. Hefner, William Thomas
 Tennessee Technological University: Thurston E. Banks, David L. Larimore, Angelo A. Volpe
 Texas, University of, at Arlington: Cathy Beene, Bill Reeves, Bill Ross, B. J. Skelton
 Texas, University of, at Austin: Katy Arris, Jody Conradt, DeLoss Dodds, Beverly Hadaway, Edwin R. Sharpe, Waneen Spirduso, James W. Vick, James G. Worley
 Texas, University of, at El Paso: Maxine V. Neill-Johnson, John K. Thompson, Robert D. Tollen
 Texas, University of, Pan American: Gary Gallup, Miguel A. Nevarez
 Texas, University of, at San Antonio: Jane Findling, Daniel O. Hogenauer, Samuel A. Kirkpatrick, Jim Skaines, Bobby Thompson
 Texas A&M University: Thomas W. Adair III, David Batson, Tina Cheatham, Tedi Zalesky Ellison, Wally Groff, Karl P. Mooney
 Texas A&M University-Kingsville: Kay Clayton, Keith Grant, Manuel L. Ibanez
 Texas Christian University: Carolyn J. Dixon, Joseph W. Helmick, Melvin E. Thomas, William E. Tucker, Frank R. Windegger
 Texas Southern University: McKen V. Carrington, Rick Holden, Joann Horton, W. Sue Leffall, Porter Robinson Jr.
 Texas Tech University: Robert Bockrath, Robert W. Lawless, Taylor McNeel, Robert M. Sweazy
 Texas Woman's University: Diana Everett, Judy Southard, Patricia A. Sullivan, G. Ann Uhler, Frank Vitro
 Thiel College: John Dickason
 Thomas More College: Victor A. Clark, William F. Cleves

Toledo, University of: Allen R. Bohl, Frank E. Horton, James M. Klein, Tim Selgo, Marnie W. Swift
 Towson State University: Bill Hunter, Dan McCarthy, Nance Reed, Jay Stanley
 Trenton State College: Kevin A. McHugh
 Trinity College (Connecticut): Richard J. Hazelton, Robin L. Sheppard
 Trinity University (Texas): Ronald Calgaard, Scott T. Chapman, Julie Jenkins, Robert C. King
 Troy State University: Kenneth S. Blankenship, Fred B. Davis, Doug Hawkins, Jack Hawkins Jr., Douglas Patterson
 Tufts University: Rocco J. Carzo, John A. Di Biaggio
 Tulane University: Anne S. Barbour, Kathy Halley, Gary Roberts, Jim Sterk, Kevin M. White
 Tulsa, University of: Diane Dickman, Rick Dickson, Robert H. Donaldson, Barry A. Kinsey, Judy MacLeod
 Tuskegee University: H. Frank Leftwich Jr.

U.S. Air Force Academy: Col. Robert B. Giffen, Lt. Gen. Bradley C. Hosmer, Ken Schweitzer, William T. Stinson
 U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Raymond Cieplik
 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Susan Petersen Lubow
 U.S. Military Academy: Bill Schutsky, Col. Albert Vanderbush
 U.S. Naval Academy: Jack Lengyel, Richard D. Mathieu, Mary McElroy
 Union College (New York): Richard S. Sakala
 Upper Iowa University: Mike McCready, Ralph L. McKay
 Upsala College: Michael J. Walsh
 Ursinus College: Adele P. Boyd
 Utah, University of: Fern Gardner, Larry R. Gerlach, Christopher P. Hill, Arthur K. Smith
 Utah State University: Chuck Bell, George H. Emert, Jim Harris, Michael Parent

Valdosta State College: Hugh C. Bailey, Masa Oreskovic, Herb Reinhard, Charles R. Tucker
 Valparaiso University: Bruce G. Berner, Alan F. Harre, William L. Steinbrecher
 Vanderbilt University: Thomas G. Burish, Paul J. Hoolahan, June Stewart, Joe B. Wyatt
 Vassar College: Andrew M. Jennings
 Vermont, University of: Richard A. Farnham, Sally Guerette, Thomas P. Salmon, Jeff Schulman
 Villanova University: Gene DeFilippo, Mary Anne Dowling
 Virginia, University of: W. James Copeland, Laurie Kelsh, Jane Miller, Lynn M. Mitchell, D. Alan Williams
 Virginia Commonwealth University: Alfreeda Goff, Richard L. Sander, Eugene P. Trani

Virginia Military Institute: Davis Babb, Col. Thomas W. Davis, John W. Knapp, Joseph C. Smith
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: David T. Braine, Stephen J. Horton, Larry N. Killough, Sharon L. McCloskey
 Virginia State University: Larry L. Brooks
 Virginia Union University: James F. Battle

Wabash College: Joseph O'Rourke
 Wagner College: Walter C. Hameline
 Wake Forest University: Dianne Dailey, Thomas K. Hearn Jr., Ron Wellman
 Wartburg College: Darold M. Wolff
 Washburn University of Topeka: Larry D. Blumberg, Janet M. Degginger, Richard A. Johanningmeier, Jenny Klamm, Hugh L. Thompson
 Washington, University of: Robert Aronson, Ralph Bayard, Barbara A. Hedges
 Washington and Lee University: Michael F. Walsh
 Washington College (Maryland): Penny J. Fall, Geoffrey M. Miller
 Washington State University: Barbara Bonace, Sallie Giffen, Clarence A. Ryan, Marcia L. Saneholtz, Samuel H. Smith, Doug Woolard
 Washington University (Missouri): Philip Godfrey, Lynn S. Imergoot
 Wayne State College (Nebraska): Peter Chapman, Donald J. Mash
 Wayne State University (Michigan): Robert V. Brennan, Dorothy E. Dreyer, Christ Petrouleas
 Weber State University: A. Earl McCain, Carol A. Nelson, Tom Stewart, Paul H. Thompson
 Webster University: Betsy Alden
 Wellesley College: Dana L. Harmon, Suzanne Jones, Louise O'Neal
 Wentworth Institute of Technology: Lee Conrad
 Wesley College: Richard E. Szlasa
 Wesleyan College (Georgia): Boyd Schoeller
 Wesleyan University (Connecticut): John S. Biddiscombe, Gale Lackey
 West Chester University of Pennsylvania: Deborah Anekstein, William E. Lide, Reginald Nealy, Paul M. Olaro
 West Georgia College: David L. Dugan, J. Blake Lanier, Bruce W. Lyon
 West Liberty State College: David C. Brooks, James W. Watson
 West Texas A&M University: Michael Chandler, Natrelle Long, Hellon K. Wilbur
 West Virginia Institute of Technology: Terry A. Rupert
 West Virginia University: Forest J. Bowman, Roger C. Jeffries, Ed Pastilong
 West Virginia Wesleyan College: George A. Klebez
 Western Carolina University: Fred Cantler, Myron L. Coulter, Betty J. Peele, C. Claude Teagarden, Larry L. Travis

Western Connecticut State University: Edward Farrington
 Western Illinois University: William E. Johnson, Gil Peterson,
 William T. Slater, Helen Smiley
 Western Kentucky University: Pam Herriford, William G. Kummer,
 Thomas C. Meredith, Jim Richards, Kelly C. Smith
 Western Maryland College: J. Richard Carpenter Jr.
 Western Michigan University: Kathy B. Beauregard, Greg Dobson,
 Adrian Edwards, Diether Haenicke, Daniel L. Meinert, Andrew
 Rivers
 Western State College of Colorado: Leila Calkins, Richard A. Kaiser
 Westfield State College: F. Paul Bogan
 Wheaton College (Illinois): Tony Ladd
 Wheaton College (Massachusetts): Chad Yowell
 Wheeling Jesuit College: E. F. Hall III
 Whittier College: Charles S. Adams, Sherry Calvert, David A. Jacobs
 Wichita State University: Darlene Bailey, Bill Belknap, Eugene M.
 Hughes, Martin M. Perline
 Widener University: Robert J. Bruce, Bruce Bryde
 Wiley College: S. A. Anderson, Solomon Masenda
 Wilkes University: Addy Malatesta
 William and Mary, College of: Barbara Blosser, John W. Conlee, John
 H. Randolph
 William Paterson College: Arthur Eason, Sabrina Grant
 William Penn College: Michael Laird
 Williams College: Robert R. Peck
 Wingate College: Beth Lawrence
 Winona State University: Stephen Juaire, Jackie Sapp
 Winston-Salem State University: Robin Barksdale-Ervin, Gerald
 McCants, William Rice, Albert L. Roseboro, Cleon F. Thompson Jr.
 Winthrop College: Anthony J. DiGiorgio, Thomas N. Hickman, Steve
 Vacendak
 Wisconsin, University of, Eau Claire: Carol L. Klun, Stephen J.
 Kurth, Melvin Lewis, Marilyn Skrivseth
 Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Otis Chambers, Donald F.
 Harden, Charles Ihrke, Daniel J. Spielmann
 Wisconsin, University of, La Crosse: Bridget Belgiovine, Gale
 Grimsliid, Douglas N. Hastad, Jane C. Meyer
 Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Cheryl A. Marra, Pat Richter,
 Paul B. Winters
 Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Doug Beard, Deanna
 D'Abbraccio, Bud K. Haidet, William A. Raabe, John H. Schroeder
 Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: Allen F. Ackerman, John
 Kerrigan, Carl "Burk" Tower
 Wisconsin, University of, Parkside: Howard Cohen, Linda Draft,
 William J. Murin
 Wisconsin, University of, Platteville: Daryl Leonard
 Wisconsin, University of, River Falls: Connie Foster, Dean
 Henderson, Elizabeth J. Oostendorp

Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point: Frank O'Brien, Nancy Page,
 Virgil Thiesfeld
 Wisconsin, University of, Stout: Rita Slinden
 Wisconsin, University of, Superior: Patricia A. Dolan
 Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: Dianne Jones
 Wittenberg University: Jeff A. Ankrom, Pam Evans, Carl F.
 Schraibman
 Wofford College: Joab M. Lesesne Jr., Ted R. Monroe, Daniel B.
 Morrison Jr.
 Wooster, College of: Gordon Collins, William D. McHenry, Nan
 Nichols
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Raymond R. Gilbert, Jon C. Strauss
 Worcester State College: Susan E. Chapman
 Wright State University: Michael J. Cusack, Charles J. Hartmann,
 Paige E. Mulhollan, Peggy L. Wynkoop
 Wyoming, University of: David L. Baker, Terri Howes, Paul L. Roach,
 Dan Viola

Xavier University (Ohio): Jeffrey H. Fogelson, Ginger Fulton, Janice
 B. Walker

Yale University: Barbara N. Chesler, Harold E. Woodsum Jr.
 Yeshiva University: Stephen B. Young
 York College (New York): Stuart Bailin
 Youngstown State University: Fred Blue, Leslie H. Cochran, Joseph
 F. Malmisur, Pauline N. Saternow

Conference Members

*American West Conference: Victor A. Buccola
 Atlantic Coast Conference: Eugene F. Corrigan, Thomas P. Mickle,
 David V. Thompson, DeLores S. Todd
 Atlantic 10 Conference: Ron Bertovich, Cindy Mazda
 Big East Conference: Linda M. Bruno, Michael A. Tranghese
 Big Eight Conference: Prentice Gautt, Carl C. James, Tracy A. Peck,
 Robyn Sharp
 Big Sky Conference: Sharon Holmberg, Ronald D. Stephenson
 Big South Conference: Carl McAloose, George F. Sasser
 Big Ten Conference: James E. Delany, Phyllis L. Howlett, Carol
 Iwaoka
 Big West Conference: Dennis A. Farrell, Rob Halvaks, Jody
 McRoberts, Paula Y. Smith
 California Collegiate Athletic Association: Pat Morgan, Tom D.
 Morgan
 Capital Athletic Conference: Richard C. Cook
 Centennial Conference: Steven F. Ulrich
 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Patrick Carter, Leon G.
 Kerry, Martha Marcolini

City University of New York Athletic Conference: Ted Hurwitz
 College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin: Jack Swartz
 Colonial Athletic Association: Kathleen Hallock, Thomas E. Yeager
 Colorado Athletic Conference: Richard A. Wolf
 Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Donald L. Scalf
 East Coast Conference: John B. Carpenter
 Eastern College Athletic Conference: Clayton W. Chapman, Dan Ghormley
 Empire Athletic Association: Bruce Mosberg
 *Gateway Football Conference: Patricia Viverito
 Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Thomas J. Brown
 Great Lakes Valley Conference: Kenneth A. Lindsey
 Great Midwest Conference: Sandra Biller, Michael L. Slive, Brenda R. Weare
 Gulf South Conference: Nathan N. Salant
 Indiana Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ralph B. McBride
 Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: John Van Why
 Ivy Group Presidents, Council of: Carolyn Campbell, Jeffrey H. Orleans
 Lone Star Conference: Shirley Morton, Ann Uhlir
 Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference: John D. Galaris
 Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference: Barbara Church, Richard J. Ensor
 Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ralph McFillen, R. Dale Smith
 Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Sheila K. Wallace Kovalchik
 Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Ken B. Jones
 Mid-American Athletic Conference: Karl D. Benson, Tim Parker
 Mid-Continent Conference: Jerry A. Ippoliti, Jan Martin, Jon A. Steinbrecher
 Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Kenneth A. Free
 Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: Linda E. Hopple
 Midwest Athletic Conference for Women: Ruth E. Peterson
 Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ralph L. Shively
 *Midwest Intercollegiate Football Conference: William L. Sylvester
 Midwestern Collegiate Conference: Bret A. Gilliland, Jonathan B. LeCrone
 Missouri Valley Conference: J. Douglas Elgin
 New England Collegiate Conference: William M. Moore
 *New England Football Conference: F. Paul Bogan
 New England Women's 8: Chad Yowell
 New Jersey Athletic Conference: Florence Labenski
 New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Association: Joyce S. Wong
 North Atlantic Conference: Stuart P. Haskell Jr.

North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Noel W. Olson
 North Coast Athletic Conference: Dennis M. Collins
 Northeast Conference: J. Stevens Hurlbut, Chris Monasch
 Northeast-10 Conference: Robert E. Burke
 Northern California Athletic Conference: James P. Jorgensen
 Ohio Athletic Conference: Timothy W. Gleason
 Ohio Valley Conference: R. Daniel Beebe, Ronald J. English
 Old Dominion Athletic Conference: Daniel E. Wooldridge
 Pacific-10 Conference: Thomas C. Hansen, Christine W. Hoyles, Mike Matthews, David Price
 *Pacific West Conference: Elwood B. Hahn
 Patriot League: Timothy Downes, Constance H. Hurlbut
 Peach Belt Athletic Conference: Marvin Vanover
 Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference: Charles A. Eberle
 Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference: Kelly Higgins, Kurt Patberg
 Saint Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: David R. Pierce
 Skyline Conference: Terry Wansart
 South Atlantic Conference: Doug Echols, Margaret Morgan
 Southeastern Conference: Damon Evans, John R. Gerdy, Roy Kramer, James L. McCullough, Patricia W. Wall, Mark Womack
 Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Ralph L. Amey
 Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference: Stephen P. Argo
 Southern Conference: Pat Britz, Charles H. Lyle, Wright Waters
 Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Cynthia R. Hill, Wallace Jackson
 Southland Conference: Donald E. Graham, Greg Sankey
 Southwest Conference: Britton B. Banowsky, Steven J. Hatchell, Coley Jordan
 Southwestern Athletic Conference: James Frank, LaRita Greer, Dell Robinson
 State University of New York Athletic Conference: Patrick R. Damore
 Sun Belt Conference: Robert J. Bernardi, John Iamarino, Craig Thompson
 Sunshine State Conference: Bob Vanatta
 Trans America Athletic Conference: William C. Bibb, Ted Gumbart, Stephen E. Sturek Jr.
 University Athletic Association: Richard Rasmussen
 West Coast Conference: Michael M. Gilleran, Don Ott, Jana M. Steel
 Western Athletic Conference: Jeff Hurd, Joseph L. Kearney, Margie McDonald, Dee Menzies
 *Western Collegiate Hockey Association: Otto Breitenbach
 Wisconsin State University Conference: Dennis Keihn
 Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Judith Kruckman

*Nonvoting

Affiliated Members

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions
Officers: Jack Demitroff
American Baseball Coaches Association: Dick Bergquist
American Volleyball Coaches Association: Donna Palivec, Sandra L. Vivas
Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic: Peter H. Lappin, William C. Sullivan
Black Coaches Association: Dennis M. Coleman
College Football Association: Sam Baker, Mike Bohn, Charles M. Neinas
College Sports Information Directors of America: Doug Vance
College Swimming Coaches Association of America, Inc.: G. Robert Boettner
Division I-A Athletics Directors Association: Gene E. Hooks
Golf Coaches Association of America: James H. Cook, Dick Copas, John R. Means
Intercollegiate Women's Lacrosse Coaches Association: Dee McDonough
Metropolitan Intercollegiate Basketball Association: John J. Powers
National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics: Karl P. Mooney
National Association of Basketball Coaches: Carol Haney, James Haney
National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Cleary, Matt Wolfert
National Football Officials Alliance, Inc.: Jim Campbell, Tommy Taylor
National Soccer Coaches Association of America: James Dyer
National Softball Coaches Association: Rayla Allison
National Strength and Conditioning Association: Bill Allerheiligen, Boyd Epley
NCAA Division I Track and Field Coaches Association: Jimmy Carnes, Gary K. Schwartz
U.S. Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association: Carl F. Ullrich
U.S. Olympic Committee: Curt L. Hamakawa, Tyrone Lockhart
USA Basketball: Warren S. Brown
USA Volleyball: Debbie Hunter
Women's Basketball Coaches Association: Betty Jaynes

Corresponding Members

Alvernia College: Thomas G. Porrazzo, Sandra Slabik
Apprentice School, The: William G. Casto
Belmont University: Kenneth Sidwell
Gwynedd Mercy College: Maria McHugh
Pratt Institute: Eugene Marshall Jr.
St. Joseph College (Connecticut): Bill Cardarelli

Visitors

Albino, Salvatore
Alderson-Broadbudd College: William C. Sizemore
American Association of State Colleges and Universities: James B. Appleberry
American Council on Education: Sheldon E. Steinbach
Andrus Group, The: Sharon Andrus
Bond, Schoeneck & King: Richard J. Evrard, Michael S. Glazier, Kathy Jones
CompUSA Florida Citrus Bowl: Chuck Rohe
Coopers & Lybrand: Maureen E. Devlin
Corrie, Bruce A.
Dallas, University of: Jackie Disselkoen
Fairtron Corporation: Ken Krogman, Clyde Walker
Hilton Hotels Corporation: Patty Stevens
Howard Payne University: Larry Nickell
Japan-America Sports Federation: Shuji "Steve" Nakada
Kazmaier Associates: Richard Kazmaier
Lees-McRae College: Mary White
Lynn University: Gregory Malfitano, Richard A. Young
Meadowlands Sports Complex: Michael Graime
Milwaukee School of Engineering: Robert G. Peterson
Molton, Allen & Williams Corporation: Wilham M. Jacka, Mickey Holmes
National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators: Jane Betts, Laura Fawcett
National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities: David L. Warren
National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges: C. Peter Magrath
National Rainbow Coalition: Charles S. Farrell
NCAA Clearinghouse: Calvin R. Symons
NCAA Presidents Commission: Wilford S. Bailey, Asa N. Green, Bernard F. Sliger
New England, University of: Karol L'Heureux, John Tumiel
Northwestern College (Minnesota): Wally M. Parish
Nippon College of Physical Education: Kosei Katsuzaki
Pasadena Tournament of Roses: Jack Biggar, Bob Cheney, Harriman Cronk, Jack French, Bud Griest, Gary Hayward, Virginia McGrew, Mike Ward
Orange Bowl Committee: Ed Williamson, Keith Tribble
Palace of Auburn Hills, The: Lou Korpas
Pellettieri, Rabstein and Altman: Melvin S. Narol
Pittsburgh, University of, at Bradford: Dennis A. Booher
St. Jude Liberty Bowl: A. F. Dudley
SMG Sports: Bill Curl
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey: Joseph P. Markoski

Tarleton State University: Lamar Johanson, Jim Johnson, Jan Lowrey, Dennis P. McCabe, Lonn Reisman
 Tele Planning International, Inc.: Masaru Yanaka
 USAir: Dave Hart, Charles Kreinar
 USAir Arena/Centre Group: Bob Zurfluh
 U.S. Department of Education: Valerie M. Bonnette
 Villa Julie College: Carol Zimmerman, Robert Zimmerman
 West Florida, University of: Richard Berg, Ken Curtis
 West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Barry Blizzard
 Western New Mexico University: Blake Faulkner, Jerry D. Jox
 Women's Sports Foundation: Donna A. Lopiano

Working News Media

ABC Sports: David Downs, Tony Petitti
 Akron Beacon Journal: Tom Giffen
 Ann Arbor News: John Beckett
 Arizona Republic: Kent Somers
 Associated Press: Tommy Hultgren, David Phillips, Doug Tucker
 Athletic Business Magazine: Rick Berg
 Atlanta Journal-Constitution: J. C. Clemons
 Austin American-Statesman: Kirk Bohls
 Baton Rouge Advocate: Dave Moorman
 Boston Globe: Mark Blaudschun
 Bradley Photography: Jim Bradley
 CBS Radio Networks: Robert P. Kipperman
 CBS Radio Sports: Frank Murphy
 CBS Sports: Len DeLuca, Rick Gentile, Raymond Harmon, Lynn Pecci, Neal Pilson, Jay Rosenstein
 Charlotte Observer: Liz Clarke
 Chicago Tribune: Ed Sherman
 Chronicle of Higher Education: Debra Blum, Doug Lederman
 Cincinnati Enquirer: Rory Glynn
 Clarion-Ledger: Rick Cleveland, Derrick Mahone
 College Football Hall of Fame: Pat Harmon
 Dallas Morning News: Doug Bedell, Ivan Maisel, Steve Richardson
 Dayton Daily News: Ritter Collett
 Des Moines Register: Susan Harman
 Deseret News: John Robinson
 Detroit Free Press: Steve Kornacki
 Detroit News: Fred Girard
 Durham Herald-Sun: Bill Brill
 ESPN: Mike Aresco, Dave Brown, Tom Odjakjian, David Zucker
 Fort Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel: Arden Moore
 Fort Worth Star-Telegram: Wendell Barnhouse
 Hickman Voice: Don Bryant
 Home News, The: Paul Franklin
 Host Communications: George T. Ackerson, Mark Dyer, W. James Host, Charles L. Jarvie

Houston Chronicle: Jonathan Feigen
 Houston Post: Jim Molony
 John Crowe Productions: Brian Anderson, Wayne Cook, Dennis Finney, Jose Garza, Doug Haskin, Dan Mackaben, Gordon Powell, Bob Robinson, Ed Rodriguez, Steve Shaw, Ray Steidel, Sam Tamez, Tom VonBerg, Don Wilson
 Kansas City Star: Bob Dutton
 Los Angeles Times: Bill Dwyre, Danny Robbins
 Louisville Courier Journal: Dave Koerner
 Mississippi Syndicated Sports: Jimmie McDowell
 Mobile Register: Tommy Hicks
 Nashville Tennessean: David Climer
 NBC Sports: Rich Hussey
 New Orleans Times-Picayune: Charles Bennett, Bill Campbell
 Omaha World-Herald: Dennis Dodd
 Raleigh News & Observer: Chip Alexander
 Raycom Sports Inc.: Ken Haines, Dee Ray, Rick Ray, Chuck Steedman, Dick Stewart
 Richmond Times-Dispatch: Jerry Lindquist
 San Antonio Express News: Chris Anderson, Jerry Briggs, Clifford Broyles, John Davenport, Don Driver, David Flores, Victor Garcia, Kevin Geil, Tim Griffin, Buck Harvey, Rick Hunter, Jim Hutton, Jerry Lara, Bill Lumpkin, Kevin O'Keefe, Bob Owen, Tim Price, Steve Quintana, Barry Robinson, Doug Sehres, Brett Thacker
 San Diego Union-Tribune: Tom Maloney
 Scripps Howard News Service: Thomas O'Toole
 Sports Illustrated: William F. Reed
 Syracuse Herald-Journal/American: Thomas M. Leo
 Tacoma News Tribune: Don Borst
 TBS Sports: John D. Vandegrift
 Trinitonia: Curtis Ruder
 Trinity University: James Hill
 Tucson Citizen: Corky Simpson
 USA Today: Debbie Becker, Steve Wieberg
 Waco Tribune Herald: Dave Campbell
 Washington Post: Steve Berkowitz

□ 88th Annual Convention Opening Business Session

Sunday Afternoon, January 9, 1994

The 88th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order at 5 p.m., with President Joseph N. Crowley, president of the University of Nevada, Reno, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

President Crowley: Ladies and gentlemen, I have been privileged to serve our Association as President this past year and for the year to come unless there is occasion, as there may well be, to impeach me. If not, I am with you for the duration of this Convention to chair the general session. Our meetings are conducted under the procedures prescribed by Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised. We are assisted in that regard by our parliamentarian and former NCAA President, known to his legion of admirers as "Mr. Mootnicity," Alan Chapman of Rice University.

One such procedure is the need to adopt the Convention Program before beginning our business. Before we do that, I need to report that the voting line on Proposal 157 is not correct. That proposal may be withdrawn. But in the event it is not, that line should say "common provision." It will be voted on in the general business session on Tuesday. I will now ask for a motion to adopt the printed program of this Convention so we may proceed with our work.

John V. Kasser (University of California, Santa Barbara): I move adoption of the printed program of this Convention.

[The motion was seconded.]

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors of Proposals 107 and 108, I move that Proposal No. 109 be considered before Proposals Nos. 107 and 108 in the Division III business session.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I move to reorder Proposal 32 before Proposal No. 31.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): I move to reorder Proposal No. 96 to precede Nos. 47, 48 and 49.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

James Haney (National Association of Basketball Coaches): I move to reorder Proposal No. 25 to follow Proposals 27 and 27-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): The Presidents Commission urges that this reordering be defeated. The Presidents Commission is prepared to support Amendment No. 27-1, which addresses this, but we feel we must have the vote on Proposal No. 25 before we put that support forward.

Kenneth A. Shaw (Syracuse University): To reiterate what was just said, the Presidents Commission is favorably disposed to No. 27 but would like to take it in sequential order.

Mr. Haney: In all due respect, the rationale behind the move is quite simply that Proposals 27 and 27-1 continue to define who the eligible pool of applicants can be as a restricted-earnings coach. Proposal No. 25 tries to identify what kind of salary that particular individual can receive. That is the rationale behind the proposal.

Mr. O'Brien: The Presidents Commission is aware of that distinction. But it feels that No. 25 needs to be addressed before Nos. 27 and 27-1. In support of the request of the NABC, we are ready to support No. 27-1 if we carry things in the order in which they are in the program.

[The motion to reorder Proposal No. 25 was defeated.]

David Price (Pacific-10 Conference): Deregulation items 162 through 173 have been pulled out of the original numerical sequence and interspersed throughout the agenda of the various business sessions. I move that the agenda be reordered to consider Proposals 162 through 173 in their original numerical order at the end of each appropriate business session.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors of Proposals 90 and 89, I would move to reverse their order in the Division I-AA meeting.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

President Crowley: Are there any other motions to reorder? Very well. We will go to the main motion, which is to adopt the printed program of the Convention as we have now amended it.

[The motion was seconded and approved and the Convention Program was adopted as reordered.]

Robert's Rules of Order provides that procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such procedures. Several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of your Convention Notice. In addition, you will find in your Official Notice several appendices listing information that may be of assistance to you. The Convention Program contains up-to-date meeting schedules and revisions of the legislation in the Official Notice.

NCAA Convention procedures are designed to ensure fairness and equitable treatment for all members, eliminate any questions of propriety and expedite your work as delegates. I won't take time to explain all of the parliamentary procedures used to ensure fairness, but I will remind the delegates that the chair fully intends to apply

these procedures throughout the business of the Convention. There are certain procedures that we employ in attempting to use our time wisely and efficiently: 1. In all of the business sessions, the chair will attempt to "eyeball" as many votes as possible, calling for a count by the Voting Committee only when there is doubt as to the majority. Although the delegates have a right to ask for it, I ask all delegates to refrain from calling for a vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issue; 2. If delegates intend to debate an issue in any business session, we ask that they be at one of the microphone locations and prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded. If the chair sees no one at a microphone, the vote will be called as quickly as possible; 3. On bylaw issues in the general business session, the chair will call for the vote in the same division sequence each time: Division I first, then Division II and then Division III. The result of a division's vote will not be announced until all divisions have voted; 4. Please remember that NCAA procedures require all votes to be by paddle or roll call when indicated, not by voice or show of hands.

The voting and speaking privileges for NCAA Conventions are set forth in NCAA legislation and are summarized in the Official Notice of the Convention. I will not repeat them here. We have a court reporter recording the business of our Convention—Mr. John Bowen of Kansas City. It needs to be noted that this is his 20th annual Convention. I don't know how many others in the room can say that, but we thank John for surviving for those 20 years.

I would like to mention a few special features of this year's Convention. This is the second year for Presidential Agenda Day, on which we devote our attention to legislation identified by the Presidents Commission as representing major policy issues of significant interest to chief executive officers. That special day is tomorrow. As a result of our experience with that concept last year, we had some kinks we had to work out of that process. We have changed the circumstance a bit this year so we can proceed with voting on other legislation on Presidential Agenda Day once we have finished the proposals designated for Presidential Agenda Day. We promised to do that a year ago. Among the other major features, the honors dinner is tonight. Your attendance is certainly urged for that outstanding annual event.

Let me also review briefly the "window of reconsideration" opportunity. It is a bit complicated. In the general business session, I will call for motions to reconsider anything adopted by the division business sessions. That will be the only time that a division decision from its separate session can be reconsidered in the general business session. We will repeat that "window" opportunity Tuesday afternoon for reconsideration of any division votes taken earlier that day. All reconsideration motions involving actions in the division business sessions must occur either in those division sessions or in that "window of reconsideration" pertaining to those sessions. No proposal

identified for action on Presidential Agenda Day can be reconsidered the following day.

CONVENTION COMMITTEES

President Crowley: It is now my privilege to introduce the Convention committees and the chair of each. The Nominating Committee, Janet R. Kittell of California State University, Chico; The Men's Committee on Committees, Prentice Gautt, Big Eight Conference and also our new secretary-treasurer; the Women's Committee on Committees, Laurie Priest, Mount Holyoke College; the Voting Committee, Barbara Walker, University of Oregon; the Committee on Credentials, Barbara Bickford, Brandeis University, and the Memorial Resolutions Committee, Catherine C. Haker, College of St. Rose.

In accordance with our procedures, reports of sports committees and general committees are not presented at this Convention. They are included in NCAA Annual Reports. You can get a copy of those reports at the registration desk. There is one available for each member institution and member conference. The report of the secretary-treasurer and the report of the Executive Committee also appear in annual reports. At the beginning of the general business session, we will entertain motions to receive and approve those reports. All official actions taken during the year by the Executive Committee have appeared in The NCAA News.

REPORT OF COUNCIL

President Crowley: We move now to the NCAA Council report for 1993. To present that report, I am pleased to introduce a Council member whose term is ending with this Convention. He certainly has been a valuable Council member. Those of you who attend the Division I-A business session will see him as the chair in those sessions. He has done a great job for us. He is a reasonably good tennis player—not getting much better over the years—but he does pretty well. He is the faculty athletics representative from the University of Oklahoma, where he is professor of law—counsel as it were to the Council—Dan Gibbens. (Applause)

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): President Crowley, your generosity is appreciated.

President Crowley and members of the Association, I am honored to present to this Convention the Council report for 1993. This report is mandated by the NCAA Constitution; it is thus essentially routine, and as our president would say, "mighty stimulating." There are things that need to be said for the record.

This report gives the membership the opportunity to challenge any of the Council's actions during this past year. This presentation is a brief summary. As is customary, this report incorporates by reference the full reports of all Council actions during the year. That reference includes the following:

First, The NCAA News publishes the actual minutes of each Coun-

cil meeting, thus informing you in timely fashion of all Council actions. In 1993, those minutes appeared in the following issues of The NCAA News: February 24, May 26, September 20 and November 22.

Second, the publication titled NCAA Annual Reports contains abridged minutes of this past year's Council meetings through August. That book is distributed at the Convention and mailed to each NCAA member. In those two publications, you will find every Council action of this past year. When the last general business session begins, there will be a motion to accept and approve the Council's full report. That will be your opportunity to challenge any of these actions.

The next procedural aspect of this report is to call to your attention certain legislative actions taken by the Council. We do this by referring you to four appendices in the Official Notice. Appendix C sets forth the interpretations that the Legislative Review Committee intends to include in the next printing of the NCAA Manual. All of these inclusions have been approved by the Council. At the beginning of Appendix C is the procedure for accepting or challenging the inclusion of any of those interpretations in the Manual. If you don't want any one of those included in the Manual, now is the time to object. Appendix D contains noncontroversial amendments that the Council adopted in 1993. The Council has the authority to take these noncontroversial actions between Conventions. Acceptance or a challenge to any of these actions occurs at this point. Does any delegate wish to object to any of the actions in Appendix D? Finally, Appendix E contains instances in which the Council modified wording in the Manual based on a review of the original intent of the legislation. Does any delegate object to any of those actions? That concludes the procedural features of this report.

Among the Council's other major involvements during the past year were the following:

The Council has overseen the implementation of the new Division I athletics certification program. The special committee, chaired by Chancellor Gerald Turner, was established to guide that important program and should be commended on its successful launch. I think applause would be appropriate at this point. (Applause)

The Council received and acted upon the reports of two hard-working and highly publicized committees—the Gender-Equity Task Force and the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics. Recommendations from those two groups that can be legislated are before you at this Convention. I want to take this opportunity on behalf of the Council and the membership as a whole to thank those two committees. They took on thankless assignments. I believe their work will prove to be highly useful, even though some recommendations may not have been as dramatic as some may have wished. While members of those two committees deserve our thanks, let me ask that they share it vicariously when I praise the chairs—President James J. Whalen of Ithaca College and

Phyllis L. Howlett of the Big Ten Conference—for their work as cochairs of the Gender-Equity Task Force, and Commissioner James E. Delany of the Big Ten Conference for chairing the financial conditions committee. (Applause)

The Council has been and will continue to track the work of committees in other areas. This includes the Special Committee to Study Rules Federation by Sport being chaired by David B. Keilitz, and the Special Committee to Review Student-Athlete Welfare, Access and Equity being chaired by Chancellor Donald F. Behrend of the University of Alaska Anchorage.

I also want to emphasize the continuing cooperative relationship between the Presidents Commission and the Council. This has been greatly enhanced by the establishment of the Joint Policy Board. Our elected NCAA officers and the Presidents Commission's elected officers work together throughout the year to deal with basic issues affecting the Association. While it is understood that these groups sometimes reflect different perspectives, we are not going to solve the problems in college athletics if there is contention between these major policy groups. Both the Commission and the Council deserve credit for the collaboration and cooperation they have shown to date.

Much of the Council's time each year is spent on interpretations, legislation, membership petitions and waivers, various committee reports, and other types of activity necessary for the effective oversight and management of the Association's affairs between Conventions. These matters are reflected in NCAA Annual Reports.

That concludes my Council report for 1993. (Applause)

President Crowley: Thank you, Dan. We now have a status report on the work of the Special Committee to Study Rules Federation by Sport. Last year, the Convention adopted a resolution calling for such a report at this Convention. For today's status report, I am pleased to introduce the chair, David B. Keilitz, athletics director at Central Michigan University, former NCAA Council member, and soon-to-be executive director of the American Baseball Coaches Association. (Applause)

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY RULES FEDERATION BY SPORT

David B. Keilitz (Central Michigan University): Two years ago at this Convention, Executive Director Dick Schultz spoke of the possible need of rules federation by sport. At last year's Convention, Proposal No. 151 passed overwhelmingly for a special committee to study rules federation by sport. The resolution called for this special committee to update the membership at this Convention and develop legislation for the 1995 Convention. The committee met three times this past year and worked on a couple of different concepts and methods to carry out our assignment. While we did this, we were very sensitive of the deregulation and simplification efforts being conducted by the Legislative Review Committee. We are working

with that committee and will continue to work with it to help formulate legislation for the next year. David Price, the chair of the Legislative Review Committee, also is on this special committee. His help in both areas is of great value.

We have approached our assignment with the belief that much of our Manual exists for the sports of football and men and women's basketball. It is our intent to find rules and regulations that can ease the administrative burdens by changing or eliminating rules that pertain to sports other than football and basketball. The committee has literally gone through the Manual page-by-page to identify some of these areas. With the help of the NCAA staff, we formulated a survey that will be sent to you after this Convention. It asks for your opinion on the areas we identified. A few of the many areas we identified for the survey involve recruiting, eligibility, practice and coaching activities.

The committee would greatly appreciate your help in this undertaking and in getting that survey back to us so we can formulate legislation. Thank you. (Applause)

President Crowley: Thanks, Dave. At this point in the agenda, we will have the Memorial Resolutions Committee report. I ask delegates, visitors and our friends in the news media to please remain silent during the reading of the memorial resolutions. Now, may I present Cathy Haker of the College of St. Rose, the chair of the Memorial Resolutions Committee.

REPORT OF MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Catherine C. Haker (College of St. Rose): Mr. President and delegates, I would like to recognize the other Memorial Resolutions Committee members. They are: Allen F. Ackerman, University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh, and Judy W. Rose, University of North Carolina, Charlotte.

Following is a listing of those men and women who have passed away since we last met:

Joseph Abrahamson, Colgate University
Wally Akervik, University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire
Ethan Allen, Yale University
Janet Hofstetler Bachna, Kent State University
Earl Banks, Morgan State University
Weems O. Baskin Jr., University of South Carolina, Columbia
Gregory Batt, Hamilton College
Darrel Black, Northern Illinois University
Andrew Brown, Southwestern Athletic Conference
Thomas L. Caldwell, Elizabeth City State University
Dan Casey, Mercy College
Willis R. Casey, North Carolina State University
Wayne Crawford, East Texas State University
Bernie Crimmins, Indiana University, Bloomington
Everett Dean, Stanford University

Silas Dunklee, New England College
Gustave J. Garcsar Sr., Moravian College
Bobby Joe Green, University of Florida
Nebra Griffin, University of New Orleans
James Haines, Morehouse College
Robert Hall, Yale University
John R. Hansen, University of Illinois, Chicago
Paul Hansen, Oklahoma State University
Ralph M. Higgins, Oklahoma State University
Jesse T. Hill, University of Southern California
Marcus Hooks, Southern Methodist University
Bobby Hunt, Central Oklahoma University
Lester Jordan, Southern Methodist University
Dottie Kelso, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
Tim Kerin, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
J.T. King, Texas Tech University
Cal Koonce, Campbell University
James R. Leonard Sr., St. Francis College (Pennsylvania)
Bill Lynn, Auburn University
Evan J. Male, University of Virginia
Chuck Mallender, University of Indianapolis
Arad McCutchan, University of Evansville
Joseph E. McEvoy, Dickinson College
Robert L. McIlwaine, Howard University
Milo Meskel, University of Portland
Bernadine Mings, Western Illinois University
Herman Morgan, Southern Methodist University
John W. Morriss Jr., University of Houston
G. Robert Mowerson, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
John Muha, University of Southern California
Casimir Myslinski, University of Pittsburgh
Bob Otto, Mankato State University
Anthony Packer, Lehigh University
Edie Patton, Ball State University
Pete Peltzer, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Bill Peterson, Florida State University
Jim Pollard, La Salle University
Ken Pope, University of New Hampshire
John Poulson, Lawrence University
Bill Reigel, McNeese State University
Bro. Michael Reynolds, Salve Regina University
Jack Riley, Northwestern University
Bill Saunders, University of Denver
Floyd Schwartzwalder, Syracuse University
Tom Scott, Davidson College
Davie L. Sheppard, Williams College
Stanley B. Sheriff, University of Hawaii, Honolulu
Lisa Siegenthaler, University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire

Albert Sloan, Carson-Newman College
 Charlotte E. Smith, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania
 Eleanor Frost Snell, Ursinus College
 Max R. Sparger, Wisconsin State University Conference
 James Valvano, North Carolina State University
 Thomas Versprille, Millersville University of Pennsylvania
 Ronald E. Walker, Kennesaw State College
 Bill Wallace, Rice University
 Budd Whitehill, Lycoming College
 Phillip O. Woodworth, Ohio University
 Harry Wright, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy
 Harold Yost, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania

Please stand and observe a moment of silence for those who have gone before us. Thank you.

If you know of persons who should be added to this list, please contact a committee member or the national office staff.

President Crowley: Thank you, Cathy. We will have a supplementary report from the committee before the conclusion of the Convention.

Speaking of conclusions, we will now conclude this session with the annual state of the Association address from our new executive director, known to most of you here, certainly respected by all who know him, a proven leader. I am delighted that he is with us today—Cedric Dempsey. (Applause)

STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

Cedric W. Dempsey: President Crowley, delegates to the 1994 Convention, colleagues and friends. I have been attending this Convention since 1966. Never did I aspire or expect to be standing before you as your executive director, but I accept this call to duty because of my commitment to intercollegiate athletics and because I know each of you shares the same commitment. I know we also share the firm belief that this field has an important role in higher education, and I will work diligently with you in strengthening the bond between academics and athletics.

Before I begin my formal remarks, I'd like you to join me in expressing our appreciation to President Crowley for his unselfishness and dedication to this Association this past year. Few are aware of the time, effort and energy he has given on our behalf. I doubt that we have ever had a president who has been called upon to lead us through any more trying circumstances than Joe led us through this past year. (Applause)

Speaking of trying circumstances, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you my wife, Dr. June Dempsey, who is sitting way over here in the corner. (Applause) When I say "trying circumstances," some of you are aware that on the very day I was called upon to become your executive director, my wife was promoted to Dean of the College of Extended University at the University of Ari-

zona. I was asked during the search process if we could make a tough call; jointly, we had to make one of the toughest calls of our lives. Both of us are committed to higher education; and for the past 40 years, together we have made professional decisions such as our most recent one. We both share in the excitement of our new adventure and thank you very much for making this possible. (Applause)

My predecessor and friend, Dick Schultz, will be recognized at the honors dinner this evening but I would personally like to acknowledge his contributions to this Association the past six years. Dick challenged us all and fulfilled his charge of representing this Association to a wide variety of constituent groups. Dick, this Association is better because of your leadership and service. You made an indelible impact upon intercollegiate athletics and on those of us who had the pleasure of working with you. Additionally, I would thank you for your valuable assistance during this transition period. All of us wish you and Jackie the very best. I know you are in the back of the room somewhere, Dick. Will you please stand so we can recognize you? (Applause)

My comments to the membership today will represent a "4-40" vision: I have spent more than 40 years in intercollegiate athletics as an athlete, teacher, coach and administrator. The "4" represents four days on the job as your executive director.

As educators, we are all familiar with the three Rs. This afternoon, I'd like to reflect on the three Rs of athletics that we are facing today: Reform, Refinement and Restructuring.

Since 1990, the Association's membership has passed significant legislation that collectively has been known as the "Reform" movement. Let's review a few of these accomplishments.

- In 1990, the membership reduced the time period for conducting spring football practice in Divisions I and II. Our legislation related to student-athlete welfare includes the requirement to conduct student-athlete exit interviews; academic counseling of student-athletes; reductions in the length of playing and practice seasons, and the elimination of athletics housing. These changes have enhanced the quality of collegial life of the student-athlete.

- At the 1991 Convention, the membership passed several cost-reduction measures, including a number of recruiting limitations and a reduction of personnel in coaching staffs in Division I sports programs. Additionally, a 10-percent reduction in financial aid grants was approved.

- In 1992, we increased core-curriculum requirements from 11 to 13 and established an initial-eligibility index, which is effective August 1, 1995. It is important to remember this legislation was passed with a four-year lead time to allow high-school freshmen to be properly counseled and to give them ample opportunity to prepare for these new requirements. In addition, we strengthened the academic requirements for continued eligibility.

- At the 1992 and 1993 Conventions, major steps were taken to in-

crease institutional control. In 1992, we required annual written approval of coaches' athletically related income. In 1993, we established a certification program requiring a thorough review of Division I athletics programs every five years.

- During this same period, more stringent Division I scheduling and sports-sponsorship requirements were implemented; minimum Division I financial aid requirements were established. Very important legislation was passed to permit separate voting for the subdivisions of Division I regarding financial aid limitations.

We can all take pride in the Association's progress during this period. Positive change has taken place because of the participation of CEOs, faculty representatives, directors of athletics, senior woman administrators, coaches and student-athletes. Let's remember that we do our very best work when all of us participate.

We should be proud of—but not complacent about—the progress we have made during the first part of this decade.

This Convention, and the 1995 and 1996 Conventions, have important roles to play in furthering our reform movement. As we proceed, I hope we have the confidence in ourselves to not only examine new reform legislation, but to revisit old legislation to make sure it is accomplishing its purpose.

That brings me to the second "R." Refinement. We legislate with the very best of intentions, but we are not perfect and the world is not static. If this Association is to continue to be successful, we must be dynamic and willing to recognize and accept change. We can do this without fear of destroying what has been accomplished in the first half of this decade.

I submit that reform does not mean rigidity, and refinement does not mean retreat. We must not lose sight of the reasons for our reform—that is to strengthen the role of intercollegiate athletics in higher education, and to ensure and enhance the welfare of student-athletes. We can be firm in support of these fundamental principles without being inflexible in our legislative efforts to protect them.

This year we will consider several legislative refinements affecting playing and practice seasons, recruiting and eligibility. Many of the proposals presented by the financial-conditions committee are the result of a fresh look at recent legislation—taking into account the current financial problems facing intercollegiate athletics. I urge you to approach these measures with an open mind—a mind open to refinement.

The third "R," restructuring, will receive as much attention in the hallways this week as it will on the Convention floor.

In late December, the Joint Policy Board decided to conduct a review of the NCAA membership structure and is soliciting ideas and models from the membership. I strongly urge you to support Resolution No. 13, which will direct a special committee, after appropriate review and dialogue, to present what it deems to be the most successful models to the membership for review and possible action at

the 1995 Convention, with final action not later than the 1996 Convention.

This opportunity is one of the most exciting we face. As I have had the pleasure of sitting among you for the past four decades, I have heard concerns—and I have expressed them myself—about the bureaucracy of our governing structure. One of the Association's greatest strengths has been its ability to refine and adjust to meet the needs of the membership. The challenge to adjust swiftly and appropriately to changing needs has grown even larger. It is appropriate for us to study, evaluate and determine whether there is a new paradigm of governance that better meets the needs of the Association. In addition to this internal review, we may want to consider establishing an external panel of managerial and organizational experts to review our structure and perhaps give the Association a fresh view of structure without any historical bias.

In any case, this total review will posture us to more effectively meet our needs in the future. When it is completed, we will either be confident that our present structure is the most efficient, or we will move toward a new model with enthusiasm.

Earlier, I mentioned the reform themes of the 1995 and 1996 Conventions. In 1995, we will examine the issues of welfare, access and equity for student-athletes. This will be a Convention focused like never before on the individuals most important to all of us—the student-athlete.

The theme of the 1996 meeting will be integrity. To achieve the level of integrity that we all desire in athletics, each of us must take ownership and responsibility for the effort. We should be proud of the strides we have made in this area. Last year, more than 800 secondary violations were processed by the Association's enforcement staff. In most of these cases, it was the individual institution or conference that took the lead in noting the violation and imposing corrective or disciplinary action. This allowed the enforcement staff to concentrate its efforts on more significant cases—those involving competitive or recruiting advantages. Individuals, institutions and conferences must accept an even greater role in this effort, and we must continue to identify those areas where we can further deregulate or simplify the rules.

At this and future Conventions, and throughout the year, we must renew our commitment to equity and fairness in intercollegiate athletics. We must redouble our efforts to provide opportunities to those who have historically been denied participation in intercollegiate athletics. We can do this in any number of ways—through NCAA legislation, individual campus policies and the staffing of our own national office.

At this Convention, we have two important opportunities to express our commitment. First, we will consider the proposals of the Gender-Equity Task Force. I encourage your endorsement of the task force's work. This legislation, combined with the Executive Commit-

tee's work in developing a more equitable championship program, provides a strong indication of this Association's commitment to gender equity.

Also, at this Convention you will consider a resolution to review and evaluate Proposal No. 16, which was passed at the 1992 Convention. This legislation does not become effective until August 1995. We need to evaluate whether we have been successful in communicating these new requirements to prospective student-athletes. We must also determine if, based on the best and most current information, these requirements meet our goals of academic integrity and educational opportunity—particularly fair opportunity for minority student-athletes. I urge your support of this resolution.

Our ability to reform, refine and restructure will certainly be tested in the coming year. The issue of a Division I-A football playoff may be one of the toughest tests. We have just completed the time of year when such discussion reaches its peak. As you are aware, the Joint Policy Board has established a working group to gather information about the concept. Once this working group has identified the issues, a committee will be established to evaluate the information. This concept has been in front of the membership before, but I agree with the board that it is time to reexamine the issue and to either place it back on the shelf or present legislation for the Division I-A membership to consider.

As we approach reform, refinement and restructuring, let's keep in mind a fourth "R"—respect. Respect for each other, respect for our different points of view, respect for the diversity of our institutional missions and respect for our Association.

I certainly don't want my comments today to leave the impression that this Association is in need of major repairs. If that is your observation, may I remind you of John Fitzgerald Kennedy's comment, "The time to repair the roof is when the sun is shining." Despite the few clouds in the sky, in Kansas City we are looking forward to the same sunny skies that we have enjoyed in Arizona and we are anxious to repair what needs to be repaired.

Recently, President Claire Gaudiani of Connecticut College wrote an article in the New York Times and closed her comments by saying that "the spotlight is over Ced Dempsey's locker now. The videotape is playing the final seconds of his big game. Make it nothing but net, Ced."

Well, as a former athlete, I know it takes more than one to play the game—someone must put the ball into play, someone must pass the ball, someone must shoot for the net and someone must be prepared to rebound. All are needed to make a good team—so, Claire, wherever you are out there, I think the spotlight is on the entire locker room, not any one locker. Each of us has a responsibility. I'm confident that together we will either hit the net on the first shot, or we'll stuff it back in on the rebound.

In serving as the executive director of your Association, I stand

ready to play any position you require of me. I'm not afraid to shoot or to mix it up in the paint. I am ready to start or to come off the bench and when our time as teammates is over, I want us to know we have given each other our very best game. Thank you very much. (Applause)

President Crowley: Ladies and gentlemen, I trust that you will not forget that we have our honors dinner at 7:30 in the grand ballroom. With that, the business of this day is concluded.

[The opening business session was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.]

□ Division I-A Business Session

Monday Morning, January 10, 1994

The Division I-A business session was called to order at 8 a.m. by Daniel G. Gibbens, faculty athletics representative at the University of Oklahoma.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Gibbens: Good morning. I think probably the best way to get started is to get started. So let's do that.

[Note: Division I-A Council members were introduced and voting procedures were explained.]

Appendix A of your Official Notice lists the 23 proposals that we will take action on today and tomorrow. Today we will take action on proposals with the asterisks. They are designated for Presidential Agenda Day items, plus any others that time permits.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Gibbens: We will now begin with Proposal No. 17.

Eligibility—Seasons of Competition

Frank R. Windegger (Texas Christian University): On behalf of the sponsors, I withdraw that proposal and ask this group to support Proposal No. 18, which I think is outstanding legislation. No. 17 needs to be looked at by the Council for any glitches. We can possibly vote on this next January. So I ask your support of No. 18.

Scouting of Opponents—Football and Basketball

James E. Delany (Big Ten Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal 24-A on behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

Adoption of Proposal 24-A will eliminate off-campus in-person scouting of opponents in Division I football. This recommendation from the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics was initially submitted by the National Association of Basketball Coaches and was supported by representatives of the women's basketball coaches and football coaches who appeared before the special committee.

Coaches can scout opponents in those sports. In the opinion of the special committee, the Council and the Presidents Commission, significant savings are anticipated by eliminating scouting. To assure actual savings, the legislation also precludes an institution from employing or paying the expenses of someone else, including professional scouting services, to scout the opponent. It is worth noting that this pro-

posal precludes all in-person, off-campus scouting of opponents in Division I football and does not permit an individual to scout at his or her own expense. I urge your adoption of this proposal.

[Part A of Proposal No. 24 (page A-42) was adopted by Division I-A, 112-2, one abstention.]

Athletically Related Income

William M. Sangster (Georgia Institute of Technology): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I move Proposal No. 28.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics developed this proposal to affirm the requirements of Bylaw 11.3.1, which states that institutions shall remain in control of who is to be an employee and the amount of salary that the employee is to receive within the restrictions specified by NCAA legislation.

The Council and Presidents Commission support this legislation to further establish control of athletics-related income by requiring all athletics department staff members, other than secretarial and clerical personnel, to receive prior written approval from the institution's chief executive officer for all athletically related income and benefits from sources outside the institution. The other substantive change in the legislation requires that staff members' requests for approval must be in writing and must include the amount and source of the income. The proposal retains the opportunity for chief executives to grant prior written approval for a staff member to receive income that does not exceed \$500 for speaking engagements or for participation in camps or clinics. Staff members must provide a detailed accounting of all such amounts over \$500 to the chief executive officer. The Council and the Commission believe that the information required by this legislation will provide the institution's chief executive officer with what he or she needs to fully understand and control compensation paid to athletics department staff members. I urge your support of this proposal.

E. Roger Sayers (University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa): I speak in favor of this proposal. It further strengthens the principle of institutional control. It certainly will help preclude any possible instances of conflict of interest. Many of our institutions already have processes and procedures like these that apply to our academic personnel. I strongly favor the proposal and urge your support.

[Proposal No. 28 (page A-47) was adopted by Division I-A, 103-11.]

Recruiting Coordinator—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football

Max W. Williams (University of Mississippi): I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 30 on behalf of the Presidents Commission and Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

The particular concern identified by the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics was large staffs of personnel other than on-field coaches in Division I football.

The special committee found it difficult to define all of the positions on the staffs and to limit the number of individuals performing certain functions. However, the committee identified recruiting-coordination functions as one that historically had been a task performed by coaches on the staff.

In recent years, many institutions have hired individuals other than countable coaches to handle recruiting-coordination functions. For several years, the membership has limited the number of coaches who can be involved in a Division I football program. The committee believes this legislation can result in significant cost reduction by requiring that recruiting-coordination functions be performed by one or more of the countable football coaches. The Council and Presidents Commission agreed with the special committee and sponsored this legislation as a step in reducing the cost of operating Division I intercollegiate football programs.

It is hoped that Proposal No. 31 also will be adopted. Through its restrictions with the number of football coaches who can recruit off campus, the personnel who handle recruiting-coordination functions can be readily identified from among countable coaches.

Please note that Proposal No. 30 permits routine clerical tasks related to recruiting coordination to continue to be handled by secretarial staffs or clerks. Further, an interpretation of the proposal indicates that a member of an institution's compliance staff may evaluate the prospect's academic information for admission and initial-eligibility purposes without being included in coaching limitations. Accordingly, adoption of this legislation appears to provide Division I institutions with a real opportunity for cost reduction in their football programs. I urge your support of this legislation.

William E. Tucker (Texas Christian University): I ask for clarification on No. 30. Let us say this passes and there is no recruiting coordinator. Am I then permitted to add a position of assistant athletics director working directly under the AD to do precisely the same things that this position eliminates? If so, how in the world will it be a cost savings?

Mr. Gibbens: Recruiting, with the exception of routine clerical tasks, must be handled by one of the countable football coaches. The answer to the question is negative. A person who is the assistant athletics director can't do the recruiting coordinator's functions. The proposal prohibits that.

[Proposal No. 30 (page A-49) was adopted by Division I-A, 74-36, one abstention.]

Off-Campus Recruiting—Division I Football

Robert M. Sweazy (Texas Tech University): On behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission, I move adoption of Proposal No. 31-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics recommended this legislation to limit the number of football coaches who can recruit off campus.

It was the committee's belief that a limit on the number of coaches who can recruit off campus will result in cost savings because coaches can remain on campus to perform other duties such as recruiting coordination, strengthening and conditioning, academic support, and supervision and counseling of student-athletes. The legislation limits the number of coaches who can recruit off campus to the head coach and seven full-time assistants in Division I-A. The institution will certify the individuals who are permitted to recruit off campus and identify them by October 1 for a one-year period. I urge your support of this legislation.

Marcia L. Saneholtz (Washington State University): I am confused about how this might save resources. Under the present legislation, it is my understanding that the seven coaches, including the head coach, can be off campus. This is the head coach plus seven assistant coaches. Now we have eight coaches off campus. It doesn't appear to me that that will be a cost savings.

Mr. Sweazy: The number of coaches has not changed. It will be seven assistants and the head coach. The thought was that those who are disallowed to recruit off campus would perform other duties such as recruiting coordination, which is now performed by different individuals. Therefore, it will eliminate the need for a few personnel. That is how the cost savings would result.

James M. O'Fallon (University of Oregon): I believe Marcia Saneholtz has the right number of coaches who will be allowed on the road. That will be an increase and that is not a cost savings. It also will increase the difficulty of the lives of those coaches who have to be on the road all of the time instead of having to rotate back in from time to time.

I don't think that this is either a cost savings or takes into account the quality of life of the assistant coaches.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I have no objection to the number of coaches who will be on the road recruiting. We ought to be realistic as to how much money we will save. I agree with the previous speaker. There should not be a hardship on one particular coach. I'm for anything that will alleviate some of the problems assistant coaches have, but I don't believe you will save any money. The individual institution has to maintain control over the cost of recruiting. If I recruit 25 people from seven or eight states, I have got to get people in those states. I am going to get them in there one way or the other. If I can do it cheaper, I will do it. If I can do it more effectively, I will. If I have seven people who recruit and I have to put them on the road, I'll do it. There are some things that bother me in this legislation that really do not affect the cost.

John O. Bolvin (University of Pittsburgh): I concur with the previous speakers. I wanted to make an additional comment. Assistant coaches who want to move up in the ranks must have a complete package of experience. You keep one or two coaches at home, and they are missing the experience of recruiting. Even though it may be

a year, that one year can be extremely important. I strongly oppose this type of legislation that makes two types of citizens out of our coaches.

James E. Delany (Big Ten Conference): Let me explain the theory behind this proposal. We attempted to eliminate the recruiting coordinator. We tried to look at duties that five or 10 years ago traditionally were handled within the coaching ranks and since have moved into the administrative area. The intent was to eliminate the administrative recruiting coordination function and put it back into the coaching area. If you identify the coaches who were going to be recruiters, you could leave two full-time assistant football coaches on the field. When they weren't on the field, they would be available to take on some administrative tasks. The proposal brings back some of the additional coaching and administrative functions that were handled by football coaches in the 1970s and '80s. That is the theory behind it.

Some arguments made against this proposal have merit. But we need to understand that the theory was to thin out some of these administrative responsibilities among recruiting coordinators and have them managed by full-time football coaches who were not recruiting and are with the student-athlete on a day-to-day basis.

[Part A of Proposal No. 31 (page A-50) was defeated by Division I-A, 47-63, one abstention.]

Contacts and Evaluations—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football

Vincent J. Dooley (University of Georgia): On behalf of the College Football Association, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 33.

[The motion was seconded.]

It became apparent with football coaches a year ago that one of the primary themes for this Convention would be cost-cutting, as shown by the diligent work of the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics. Therefore, it was necessary for coaches to unite and propose a contact-evaluation rule that would enable them to effectively perform their all-important job of evaluating and recruiting student-athletes in the spirit of cost containment.

Proposal No. 33 represents an untold number of man hours put in by football coaches and represents a significant reduction in cost. First of all, there will be a reduction of the evaluation opportunities from four to two during the academic year—one in the fall and one in May. Number two, by increasing the number of quiet days and dead periods, the proposal will eliminate approximately 38 days from the football-recruiting calendar, which is a significant reduction in cost. While 38 days represents a significant reduction in recruiting activity and a significant cost savings, two concerns need to be addressed.

The first concern is that the evaluation period in May is increased from 15 to 20 days. The coaches felt that additional time was needed in the earlier evaluation period. However, remember that a net of 38 days is eliminated from the recruiting calendar by this proposal.

The second concern is that the proposal provides for the restoration of one of what coaches feel is the best recruiting rule that football ever had—to be able to go into the high schools and contact student-athletes once a week a maximum of seven times. There is concern that there would be this large number of coaches in the high schools who would be bothersome to the school and the student-athletes. My only response to that is we can draw upon history in that regard. That did not happen before when the rule was in effect. And there were actually more visiting opportunities when the old rule was in effect.

As I have pointed out, it is the best recruiting rule that football ever had on contacts and evaluation. The Recruiting Committee supports this rule. The coaches worked hard in proposing a rule that will cut cost significantly yet afford them the opportunity to perform their job of evaluating and recruiting effectively. It also is supported by the faculty representatives and the athletics directors of the CFA. I hope you will vote to show confidence in the coaches' efforts in this proposal.

Charles F. "Rick" Taylor (University of Cincinnati): In addition to what Vince said, the CFA coaches thought this was a rule that was not only very understandable but easy to administer. Programs like Georgia and the University of Cincinnati all agree that this is probably the best recruiting rule we can have. We urge your passage.

James E. Delany (Big Ten Conference): The Division I-A group should understand that if Proposal 33 passes, the football contact and evaluation period in Proposal No. 34, which represents the position of the special committee, would be moot. That could lead in Division I-A football to three contact evaluations with as many as seven contacts—more than one a week. In basketball, you would have two evaluations and three contacts if that portion of No. 34 relating to basketball passed.

It is the position of the special committee—after full discussion with the NABC and the American Football Coaches Association—that two evaluations and three contacts are sufficient. In addition, Proposal No. 34 limits the number of times that more than one contact can be made. It is important to note that the enforceability of No. 34, with three contacts, is probably easier to coordinate than the contact in No. 33. You are likely to have two different standards—two evaluations and two contacts in football and two evaluations and three contacts in basketball.

Although the recommendation of the special committee doesn't reflect the pure use of the NABC or the American Football Coaches Association proposal, it does reflect their input from the calendar and their thought with respect to the legislation.

Mr. Dooley: I think what Jim pointed out is exactly the way we should be heading. We should legislate what the particular sport has found best for that sport. I see nothing wrong with having a rule for football that has been proven to be a very good rule and have a dif-

ferent rule for basketball. The point that Jim makes is exactly why I feel as though we should have legislation in football as well as in basketball in this regard.

[Proposal No. 33 (page A-51) was adopted by Division I-A, 84-27, one abstention.]

Official Visits—Division I Football and Basketball

Ferdinand A. Geiger (University of Maryland, College Park): I move adoption of Proposal No. 38-A on behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

The special committee to review financial conditions identified official visits to a member institution's campus as a potentially cost-reduction in recruiting. Accordingly, the committee recommended and the Council agreed to sponsor legislation to reduce the permissible number of official visits in football from 70 to 56.

It is the committee's view that 56 is still a sufficient number to accommodate the recruiting needs of Division I members. In the Division I business session, Part C of this legislation will be considered. If adopted, it will provide an opportunity to establish a waiver process for an institution that has made a head-coaching change after all or nearly all of the permitted official visits in that sport have been utilized. I urge the Convention to adopt this legislation.

[Part A of Proposal No. 38 (page A-67) was adopted by Division I-A, 61-44, one abstention.]

Telephone Calls—Divisions I and II Football

E. James McCloskey (University of Florida): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 41.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is another series of proposals recommended by the Legislative Review Committee as part of the effort to deregulate and simplify Bylaw 13. This proposal simplifies current legislation about when telephone calls can be made to prospects in Divisions I-A and I-AA football.

It no longer will be necessary to "track" one calendar for when telephone calls can be made and a separate calendar for when contacts can be made. The proposal only requires that the institutions know when it is and is not the contact period. During the contact period, prospects may be called at the institution's discretion. Outside the contact period, telephone calls can be made to a prospect only once a week. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 41 (page A-75) was adopted by Division I-A, 106-8.]

Summer Financial Aid

Jeremy Foley (University of Florida): On behalf of the sponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 43.

[The motion was seconded.]

As we discussed this proposal with our colleagues this summer and at this Convention the last several days, it is obvious there are a few misunderstandings I would like to clear up.

First and foremost, we need to understand that this is not a cost issue. A lot of you have expressed concern that this proposal will increase costs. There is no cost increase involved in Proposal No. 43. The current NCAA rule will allow five years of aid. This amendment allows the same five years of aid. In its most simplistic terms, we are taking a summer term from the fifth year and trading it for a summer term in the first year. I have heard from others that this creates an unlevel playing field. Again, I point out that the five years of aid remain in effect. If you, as an institution, are not currently awarding a fifth year of aid, nothing changes for you. It does not put you at a competitive disadvantage. As it relates to the unlevel playing field, I will submit that current rules already have greatly leveled playing fields because they allow an institution to have the financial resources to pay for the entire summer term for all students. Therefore, we do have an unlevel playing field.

The most compelling reason to do this is to help the student-athlete. It will assist freshman retention and graduation rates. That is our challenge and our job. Student-athletes are required to attend summer school as a condition for admittance to the university. The courses they attend are set by the university, not the athletics department. As academic requirements and progress rules have become stronger in the past decade, many schools have contemplated adding summer programs as an avenue to provide financial aid to student-athletes at no additional cost. We have been told that this creates a recruiting advantage. Telling a young man or woman that they have to give up a summer job or vacation to come to school is no recruiting advantage; especially when another school can have them come to their school and not have to attend summer school. There have been some concerns expressed that this will allow practice to start early. Current rules prevent that. In fact, this rule provides stronger safeguards than are currently in place.

The Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism has opposed this measure. The committee contends that it does not provide the same opportunity for all students. Again, if students do not have to come to summer school, they would not have to give up summer vacations. We therefore don't think that that is an applicable point.

This legislation helps student-athletes. It gives them a greater opportunity to succeed. It does not cost any more than we are currently spending on scholarships. It does not provide a competitive advantage in any way. This amendment helps students. Yesterday, Executive Director Dempsey said next year's Convention will be dealing with student welfare. We have an opportunity today to do something to assist students. In the past several years, we have increased standards and satisfactory-progress requirements, but we have done very little to help student-athletes meet those challenges. I urge your support of this proposal. There is no additional cost. The competitive playing field remains the same. The main mandate of our job is to help student-athletes.

Charles S. Harris (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I urge you to vote against Proposal No. 43. The Council and financial aid committee believe this proposal is unnecessary. Current financial aid regulations permit all prospective student-athletes who have financial needs to attend summer school before their initial enrollment and to receive institutional financial aid.

Proposal No. 43 does not treat student-athletes equally. Academically marginal students receive athletics aid to attend summer school whether or not the student has financial need. The financial aid committee also believes that the proposal is subject to misuse. For example, admissions officers will be reluctant to admit unqualified student-athletes and may be forced to admit them on the condition that the athletics department fund the student-athlete's summer-term attendance.

In conclusion, the financial aid committee and the Council ask you to oppose Proposal No. 43. It will increase cost without properly directed funds for needy student-athletes.

Walter B. Newsom (Mississippi State University): On behalf of the Southeastern Conference's student-athlete advisory committee, I urge your support for this proposal. Committee members believe that summer programs are extremely important in helping students—particularly those who are academically at risk and need to get their feet on the ground academically. For many students who indicate satisfactory progress, it is much more important for them to have a solid start academically before engaging in the rigors of competition. On behalf of the Southeastern Conference's student-athlete advisory committee, I urge your support of this proposal.

Karl P. Mooney (National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics): I urge your support of Proposal No. 43. This rule does not increase costs to the institution. In fact, the cost of attending college continues to escalate. Significant savings could result in that this would provide to all student-athletes who qualified during the summer preceding the first semester.

Finally, past athletics studies demonstrated the value of providing instruction during the summer term, particularly in retention. I urge your support for the proposal.

Jason C. Wilkie (Central Michigan University/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports this proposal because it provides the marginal athlete the opportunity to attend college. It helps student-athletes meet the increased NCAA academic requirements. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges your support of this proposal.

Pat Culbertson (Louisiana State University): With regard to the important principle of cost containment, there is such a thing as being penny-wise and pound-foolish. I urge your support for Proposal No. 43.

The principle of cost containment should never interfere in spending our resources wisely. Proposal No. 43, if passed, would give us

the opportunity to invest in an early, sound and timely manner for our student-athletes. From the student-athlete's welfare standpoint and the perspective of the faculty athletics representative, the earlier we introduce student-athletes to their college experience, the greater probability of their academic success. I urge your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 43 (page A-78) was defeated by Division I-A, 34-73, five abstentions.]

Division I-A Football—Preseason Squad Limit

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 44 on behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics noted that large football squads that go well beyond the grant limit can be expensive. Specifically, the committee noted substantial costs related to housing and meals for practice before the start of the academic year. Accordingly, the Council and the Presidents Commission joined a number of Division I-A institutions in sponsoring this legislation to limit squad size to 105 student-athletes before the institution's first day of classes or its first intercollegiate football contest, whichever occurs earlier.

The legislation still permits a number of walk-ons and student-athletes to be a part of the program and permits still more to join the squad once school has started. I urge your support of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 44 (page A-80) was adopted by Division I-A, 97-11.]

Preseason Football Practice—Orientation Period

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 46 on behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

In reviewing issues related to operating costs of intercollegiate athletics programs, the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics noted that the cost of providing housing, meals and support services to student-athletes before the start of the academic year results in significant expense.

Nonetheless, the committee determined that it will retain annual practice opportunities for student-athletes to prepare them for intercollegiate competition. The committee identified the freshman orientation period before the start of preseason football practice as unnecessarily long. It was decided the period could be shortened and cost reduced. Accordingly, the special committee recommended and the Council and Presidents Commission supported this legislation to redo the freshman orientation period from four days to two.

Two days still provide opportunity for the orientation program to familiarize student-athletes with the institution academically as well as athletically before a large number of returning students begin practice. I urge your support of this legislation.

Karl P. Mooney (National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics): I urge the defeat of this proposal. The proposal is not about finances or football as stated in the Official Notice. The impact will be felt most severely in the academic sector.

The costs could not be measured. If passed, it could cost the involved student-athletes their enrollment in your institution. A period of four orientation days is highly recommended by the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee for football student-athletes. This is the only concentrated time period that academic advisors can claim full attention of their charges before classes begin. I ask that you consider the negative academic impact of this proposal and soundly defeat it.

[Proposal No. 46 (page A-83) was adopted by Division I-A, 58-55, one abstention.]

Graduate Assistant Coach—Division I-A

Bill Byrne (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I move Proposal No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 55 permits an institution to employ additional graduate assistants provided at least one of the three graduates is an ethnic minority. How did this proposal come about? At this summer's football coaches meeting, they were greatly distressed about the number of African-American coaches who had not been moving up in the ranks. This is what was proposed.

There seems to be a need for African-American coaches. A large percentage of our football teams in Division I-A are composed of black student-athletes, yet there are fewer than a dozen black graduate assistants out of the 106 schools in the division. You know and I know that assistant coaches, head coaches and administrators come up through the ranks from GAs. This is something that we think will encourage more schools to hire ethnic minorities. If you think back to the 1960s when affirmative action came into being, there was much resistance, yet affirmative action works.

This proposal is like an affirmative action program for the NCAA. Ethnic minorities can be hired by institutions and move up in the ranks to become assistant coaches, administrators and head coaches. I urge its adoption.

William C. Carr (University of Houston): I attended the American Football Coaches Association's convention and sat in on the sessions of the Black Coaches Association during which there was discussion about professional advancement opportunities. This legislation, in my professional experience and judgment, is entirely consistent with the concerns that were articulated by the Black Coaches Association. In fact, I am told that there are less than 10 minorities among the current 210 opportunities in Division I-A football at this time. This legislation would guarantee opportunities for as many as 105 members of ethnic minorities in Division I-A football. I urge adoption of this legislation.

Charles Whitcomb (San Jose State University): I am chair of the Minorities Opportunities and Interests Committee. On behalf of the committee, I urge your defeat of this proposal.

The committee agrees with the concept in encouraging and providing opportunity for ethnic minorities for all levels of participation in athletics. However, we do not support the legislation as written. The committee feels that the legislation was somewhat unclear. For example, if an institution already has a minority graduate assistant, it will not be bound by this legislation to hire another one to fill that position. As an alternative, the committee is recommending that the sponsor consider legislation that requires that one of the two current graduate assistant positions be designated for minority positions.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I am fortunate enough to have two black graduate assistants on my staff. I would hope that people in athletics understand that the number of qualified black coaches is not very high. The only way we can educate these young people, who may not be as qualified as others because of their experience, is to take them because of their general experience with intercollegiate programs such as Penn State's. I am more than willing to take those people and work with them.

I am going to support and mentor them, and hopefully in a year or two they are able to do a good job at any college level. I am for this proposal even though we have two black coaches now. In the long run, we are still going to do a better job with the young black coaches. I know how hard it is right now to find jobs, have meaningful experiences and eventually have the confidence to do a job at any level. I urge your adoption.

Marcia L. Saneholtz (Washington State University): I want to second what Charlie Whitcomb said. I find it incredible that when a large percentage of our football teams are made up of African-Americans that we don't have a sufficient manpower pool to fulfill our current obligation to assure that at least one and maybe even two of the current graduate assistants are African-Americans.

[Proposal No. 55 (page A-92) was defeated by Division I-A.]

One-Time Transfer Exception—Division I-A Football

Milo R. Lude (Auburn University): I move Proposal No. 74.

[The motion was seconded.]

Members of the Convention, I urge your support of No. 74. A year ago, we had a reconsideration on this particular item. It very nearly passed after it was reconsidered.

I suggest to you that on the side of fairness and on the side of being consistent, this proposal is absolutely essential. Let us vote affirmatively on this. We urge your support.

David Hart Jr. (East Carolina University): I reiterate what my colleague Mike Lude said. It is a strong feeling from the College Football Association in the sense of fairness that this proposal needs to be adopted.

We currently have a one-time transfer exception in football to Di-

vision I-A from Division I-AA. This proposal would certainly deliver the fairness that Mike Lude spoke to.

[Proposal No. 74 (page A-110) was adopted by Division I-A.]

Spring Football Practice—Divisions I-A and I-AA

Robert Goin (Florida State University): On behalf of all members of the Atlantic Coast Conference, I move Proposal No. 112.

[The motion was seconded.]

Current spring football legislation will permit no more than 15 practice sessions within a 29 consecutive day period, omitting vacation and examination days, and the days institutions could close because of inclement weather.

Only 10 of the 15 sessions can involve contact and athletics-related activities are limited to 20 hours per week. The sponsors of this legislation believe that the proposal allows for institutions to decide on the day off that best fits their program needs and academic schedules. It provides much-needed flexibility.

As indicated in your Official Notice, the Division I Steering Committee supports this proposal. I also urge you to support Proposal No. 112.

Richard A. Rosenthal (University of Notre Dame): I would like to speak in support of this proposal on behalf of the steering committee and the Council.

As indicated in the rationale, spring practice already is limited significantly in the number of days. Current regulations require one day off. There is no more need to eliminate Sundays as the day of practice. It will give flexibility for academic schedules at institutions. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 112 (page A-151) was adopted by Division I-A.]

Spring Football Practice—Divisions I-A and I-AA

Douglas A. Dickey (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 113.

[The motion was seconded.]

Historically, the decision as to what type of uniform worn at a practice session has been at the discretion of the head football coach. Practice is limited by legislation to 10 days of full pads and five days without pads.

The use of shoulder pads, as indicated by Proposal No. 113, will allow coaches increased flexibility. A higher percentage of games involve passing. Head coaches must drill teams on pass protection and diving for the ball. This proposal certainly increases protection for the players. We recommend passage of Proposal No. 113.

Paul L. Roach (University of Wyoming): The NCAA currently does not specify or regulate the practice uniform for other sports—particularly contact sports. Allowing the use of shoulder pads not only will address the safety factor, it also enhances instruction for some of the basic fundamentals and skills—particularly in pass protection. We urge the passage of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 113 (page A-152) was adopted by Division I-A.]

Training-Table Meals

Ferdinand A. Geiger (University of Maryland, College Park): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 126.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council has decided to sponsor this legislation without taking a position in support or in opposition to it. The Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics, identified training-table meals for student-athletes outside the playing season as a possible unnecessary additional expense.

Many questions have been raised about how much will actually be saved by eliminating such meals and the appropriateness of this proposal. The committee and the Council felt that it would be good for the membership to have the chance to vote this proposal up or down without recommendation. Therefore, it is so offered.

Chris M. Studer (Boston University/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee has discussed this proposal and respects the cost cutting intended by this legislation. But the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee unanimously determined that well-balanced meals throughout the year are in the best interest of student-athletes.

The problem the committee sees with this proposal is that although competition is year-round, practice and nutritional needs of the student-athletes are not. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee opposes this proposal because of the health needs of student-athletes. The most important issue to the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is concerns for student-athletes. Their welfare needs to be put before cost reduction.

Beverly D. Lewis (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): Although recognizing the wisdom behind this proposal is to help integrate student-athletes into the university campus as well as to cut costs, the Southeastern Conference's student-athlete committee unanimously opposes this proposal because student-athletes train year-round and diet is such an important part of training.

The committee believes that the institution should be permitted to provide one training meal per day throughout the academic period. Thus, on behalf of the Southeastern Conference's student advisory committee, I urge your opposition to this proposal.

Homer C. Rice (Georgia Institute of Technology): I stand in opposition to this proposal. I believe that safeguards play an important role in this type of thing. Several of our programs around the country are just on the cutting edge of some very important things. I think that training-table meals are very, very instrumental for the student-athlete's well-being. If this proposal passes, it will hamper that and will be very devastating in my opinion. I witnessed many years ago as a young coach a death caused by uncontrolled eating habits of a young athlete. I stand in opposition to anything that will curtail the control of nutritional programs for a student-athlete.

Cecil W. Ingram (University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa): A recent survey on our campus indicated that this legislation would increase the cost of meals on our campus.

[Proposal No. 126 (page A-164) was defeated by Division I-A, 56-56, two abstentions.]

Pregame Housing

Ferdinand A. Geiger (University of Maryland, College Park): I move Proposal No. 127 on behalf of the Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is another proposal from the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics that the Council has decided to sponsor without taking a position in support of or in opposition to the proposal.

The special committee identified special housing of teams off-campus for a home athletics contests as an unnecessary expense. The Council has sponsored this legislation to permit the membership to consider and vote on the issue.

Jeremy Foley (University of Florida): I speak in opposition to this as a matter of principle. This is a management decision. If you don't want to put them in a hotel before a game, don't do it. Every school has a different circumstance. I urge you to defeat this proposal.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): As a football coach at a college campus without an athletics dorm, I don't know how we could possibly know for sure that our entire team is going to show up on Saturday morning.

Many of you understand that at a state college you are coaching before anywhere from 30,000 to 95,000 people. The alumni is going to come back and hardly wait to get hold of you and talk to you regardless of what time it may be. If the hour gets later and the drinking gets freer, they are knocking on doors. When we play away games at some places we have to have security control the floors where our players are. We have to turn off the telephones because of people trying to contact our players. I could envision one of my players trying to sleep in a dormitory and having some alumni come by knocking on his door at two o'clock in the morning. I also can envision one of my players telling the guy to knock it off and the person not leaving; and before you know it, you have got yourself a fight.

I agree with the previous speakers. I think it is a university problem. If you are spending too much, cut it out. If we cannot take the team off-campus at a place like Penn State, I would be very, very concerned about what would happen the following day. I mean that very sincerely. I hope that we will not pass this legislation.

[Proposal No. 127 (page A-165) was defeated by Division I-A.]

Recruiting—Telephone Calls—Division I

Jeremy Foley (University of Florida): On behalf of the sponsors of Proposal No. 140, I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is very easily a cost-containment measure. We threw this out two years ago. This proposal allows colleges to use a toll-free 1-800 number, which is more cost efficient than collect phone calls. I urge your support of this proposal.

John R. May (Rice University): I urge the membership to vote in favor of Proposal No. 140. Our research has shown that by using 800 numbers, the cost is from 15 cents to 28 cents a minute. Operated-assisted calls will average close to one dollar per minute. We are, therefore, very much in favor of this proposal and urge your support.

Robert M. Sweazy (Texas Tech University): On behalf of the Council, I would like to speak in support of this proposal to allow institutions to have 800 numbers. As Bobby May said, it is definitely a cost savings. The Council believes it is a cost-effective proposal and urges your support.

[Proposal No. 140 (page A-176) was adopted by Division I-A.]

[The Division I-A business session was adjourned at 9:35 a.m.]

□ Division I-AA Business Session

Monday Morning, January 10, 1994

The Division I-AA business session was called to order at 8:25 with Irwin Cohen, Northeastern University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Cohen: The 1994 Division I-AA business session is now convened. Our parliamentarian is Thurston Banks, Tennessee Technological University, and former member of our Council.

[Note: Various announcements were made and Division I-AA members of the Council were introduced.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Maximum Awards—Division I-AA Football

R. Daniel Beebe (Ohio Valley Conference): I move Proposal No. 87.

[The motion was seconded.]

The institutions that sponsor this legislation have basically asked the membership to consider reducing the cost of operating Division I-AA football programs in today's economic times, where many of our campuses have difficult financial situations in which the money that is funded for athletics programs is also being competed for in other areas of the campuses, where many of the other areas of the campuses are having difficulty funding their own programs and the total institution's financial situation calls for reduction in all areas.

The sponsors of this legislation feel that it is important that funding needs to be reduced and that reducing scholarships could cause more competition on the field, throughout the division and throughout individual conferences.

On behalf of the sponsors, I ask you to support this legislation.

Paul H. Thompson (Weber State University): I speak in favor of the motion. I understand some concerns about this because of the relative competition between Division I-A and Division I-AA and Division II, but I still favor this motion.

I heard from the Presidents Commission that 70 percent of the Division I schools are running deficits in their athletics programs. That's certainly the case at our institution. It would help us if we could reduce the number of scholarships significantly. I hear people saying, "My understanding of athletics is that coaches want to be very competitive and adding scholarships helps, adding coaches helps, adding travel budgets helps, and so on."

It's up to this body to say this is the level at which we'll compete. If we are all at 45 scholarships or less, we compete together. Yesterday, I heard concern about whether we can compete with Division I-A schools. Yesterday, I watched some pro teams play. It's my understanding that their roster is limited to 47 players. If the Giants can get by with 47, maybe we can get by with 45.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I oppose Proposal No. 87 for the following reasons: The NCAA would be well-advised to recognize that reducing from 65 to 45 the maximum annual limit for financial aid awards to Division I-AA football student-athletes would be an absolute disaster as far as Division I-AA football is concerned.

The questionable nature of this proposal is couched in the suggestion that it's a cost-effective move. I don't agree. As a matter of fact, I think that's nonsense. A reduction in football grants-in-aid to 45 would render Division I-AA football institutions, which compete against Division I-A schools, even less competitive than they are now. It also would make Division I-AA campuses less competitive with a large number of Division II schools, given current recruiting regulations.

Essentially, the bottom line is this: Division I-AA universities would be weaker than both the Division I-A campuses and a significant number of Division II schools. The advent of such a scenario would be absolutely intolerable for the faculty, administrators and kids on Division I-AA campuses that field football teams.

As I see it, invoking this proviso would result in the disintegration, if not abrogation, of Division I-AA. Our programs will be forced to garner whatever resources they could find to enable them to move to Division I-A status. That's why I say you can't lean on this issue of cost effectiveness. Moving to Division I-A is going to cost more money.

As an original member of the Presidents Commission, and as a longtime CEO at North Carolina A&T State University, I take sharp exception to the attempts being used by some individuals to promulgate what I perceive to be a fraud upon the structure of the NCAA. That fraud, that scenario would be actualized, if the delegates who are present today make the decision to actually authenticate Proposal No. 87. To put it simply, No. 87 is bad legislation. It has not been carefully thought out and it poses an immediate detriment to football programs on most Division I-A campuses. It is intolerable legislation in that no attempt was made by the structure to poll all of the campuses in Division I-AA for purposes of determining what they wished to occur. The legislation is ill-founded, it is misguided. It is, in the eyes of some, fraudulent, and it is absolutely fraught with mischief.

I therefore urge in the strongest terms possible that we overwhelmingly denounce Proposal 87 for what it is—unsatisfactory and bad legislation.

John L. Allen (University of Connecticut): The issues raised thus

far addressed such things as competition and cost containment. I'm sympathetic to those institutions that wish to reduce their costs. I'm sympathetic to the arguments about competition. But I believe that when we speak in those terms, we are really missing the point.

The major purpose of intercollegiate athletics at the Division I level is to provide educational opportunities for young people. I don't believe we solve anything by reducing educational opportunities. If this proposal should pass, it represents a loss of approximately 1,000 grants-in-aid. Of those approximately 1,000 grants-in-aid, at least half will come from minority populations.

If you want to talk about costs, think in terms of social costs. What are the social costs to your institution, your state and to the nation of eliminating between 500 and 1,000 grants-in-aid? What are the social costs of depriving between 500 and 1,000 young men of a college education? That should be our primary concern.

The other issues that were raised are important. You can't deny the problems of cost on the campuses. You can't deny that. But I believe that the social benefits across the board of having the additional grants-in-aid far outweigh the institutional costs.

One final point about the difference between intercollegiate and professional competition and the numbers involved. The Grants get by with 45. But when those players get hurt, they go out and buy some more. We cannot do that.

Donald E. Graham (Southland Conference): I rise in opposition to Proposal No. 87. The horizon for Division I-AA is extremely foggy right now with the possibility of NCAA restructuring moving ahead. We are currently a vastly diverse subdivision. However, if restructuring takes place in the forms that are being discussed, there may be many institutions currently in Division I-A that will be looking for a home. I hope Division I-AA will be that home and welcome those institutions with open arms.

Even if restructuring was not on the horizon, a 43-percent cut in our scholarship limit is not in the best interest of the division. As our new executive director said in the state of the Association address yesterday afternoon—there is that fourth "R," respect. We should respect the diversity of our membership and this subdivision.

The issue of further scholarship reduction is critical to those of us who wish to maintain as competitive programs as we are individually able to do so. A cut down to 45, a unilateral cut at that, in our one subdivision only will put us in the position of offering only a handful more scholarships than our colleagues in Division II. While I respect the quality of football that is played at the Division II level, I don't want to see our numbers parallel those of Division II. If the cuts were enacted across all divisions, I think they might be a little bit more palatable. But they are not.

I urge that you respect the diversity of the membership and urge you to defeat Proposal 87.

William W. Sutton (Mississippi Valley State University): I urge

opposition to Proposal 87 for several reasons, some of which have been mentioned.

I would like to emphasize that there are many young men who only come to college because they get a grant-in-aid to play football. This would cut out somewhere between 500 and 1,000 scholarships, maybe even more. A large percentage of those would be minorities who could not come to college otherwise.

Social ills certainly are not the prime interest of the NCAA, but I think all of us have a stake in this problem. We should certainly take into consideration the cost factor as it relates to our problems with budgets on campus and the cost factor that we have as a part of a greater society.

I would like to point out something that has not been mentioned. Some Division I-AA schools are now getting sponsorships. A few are even getting on television. We would lose that opportunity to have national or regional exposure if we go to a different level of football. Many of us use promotional games, even though they are not televised, to make our budget. We get one or two promotional games to help us make the budget instead of running a deficit. We need to have our squads more competitive, not necessarily in the same vein as Division I-A, but we don't need to be at a greater deficit than we are to Division I-A.

I would urge that you give serious consideration to defeating Proposal 87.

William B. DeLauder (Delaware State University): I rise in opposition to Proposal 87.

I do not want to rehash what has already been said. The arguments are compelling in opposition. We are all in favor of cost cutting. We are all committed to find ways to reduce the size of our budgets. But I believe that reducing student aid and access should be the last place that we look to cut cost. We ought to be trying to expand opportunities for young people, not reduce opportunities.

[Proposal No. 87 (page A-122) was defeated by Division I-AA, 22-63, 33 abstentions.]

Eligibility—Seasons of Competition

Donald E. Graham (Southland Conference): On behalf of the Division I-AA sponsors, I would like to withdraw Proposal 17 as it pertains to I-AA, but would urge your support in the general business session of Resolution No. 18. Thank you.

Scouting of Opponents—Football and Basketball

Oscar C. Page (Austin Peay State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 24 on behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of Proposal No. 24 will eliminate all campus in-person scouting of opponents in Divisions I-A and I-AA football and Division I basketball. This recommendation from the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics was ini-

Division I-AA Business Session

tially submitted by the National Association of Basketball Coaches. It was supported by representatives of the women's basketball coaches and football coaches who appeared before the special committee.

It is the coaches' view that scouting opponents of these sports can be accomplished by sharing game tapes. It is the opinion of the special committee, the Council and the Presidents Commission that significant savings can be anticipated from eliminating scouting. In order to assure actual savings, the legislation also precludes an institution from employing or paying the expenses of someone else, including a professional scouting service, to scout an opponent.

It is worth noting that in order to guard against the appearance of competitive advantage, the proposal precludes all in-person, off-campus scouting of opponents in Division I football and basketball and does not permit an individual to scout at his or her own expense.

I urge your support of this proposal.

[Part A of Proposal No. 24 (page A-42) was adopted by Division I-AA, 97-17, two abstentions.]

Recruiting Coordinator—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football

Oscar C. Page (Austin Peay State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 30 on behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

The primary concern identified by the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics was the cost of maintaining large staffs and personnel other than on-field coaches in Division I football. The special committee found it difficult to define all of the positions on staffs or limit the numbers of individuals performing certain functions; however, the committee identified the recruiting coordinator function as one that historically had been a task performed by coaches in the sport.

In recent years, many institutions have hired individuals other than countable coaches to handle recruiting coordination. For several years, the membership has limited the number of coaches who can be involved in Division I football programs. We believe that this legislation can result in a significant cost reduction by requiring that the recruiting coordination functions be performed by one or more of the countable football coaches.

The Council and Presidents Commission agree with the special committee that sponsored this legislation as a step in reducing the cost of operating Division I intercollegiate football programs. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 30 (page A-49) was adopted by Division I-AA, 104-4, six abstentions.]

Coaching Limitations—Division I-AA Football

Oscar C. Page (Austin Peay State University): I move Proposal No. 32 on behalf of the Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Inter-

collegiate Athletics recommend Proposal No. 32 as a means of cost reduction in Division I-AA. The Presidents Commission decided not to take a position on the proposal but to sponsor it in order to permit the Division I-AA membership to evaluate the legislation and to vote on it. This would reduce from seven to six the limit on head or assistant coaches in Division I-AA.

I urge your support.

Larry L. Travis (Western Carolina University): I rise to point out that the Presidents Commission brought this to the floor. I ask you, as does the Presidents Commission, to lend your support to this proposal.

Robert G. Hayes (McNeese State University): I urge your defeat of Proposal 32 for several reasons. By reducing your staff by one, the head coach becomes a position coach, which will lessen his time for the other responsibilities. It also will give him less time to deal with the athletes, to coach them individually and to be available to them for counsel. If Proposal No. 30 passed, we have precluded ourselves from having a recruiting coordinator. Let's not reduce our staff by one more person.

If Division I-A passes 31-A, it has allowed one more person to go on the road recruiting. I think that puts Division I-AA at a distinct disadvantage, especially for those people who are playing the Division I-A schools for a money game. It gives them one less person to do their recruiting to prepare their team for that big money game. Neither Division I-A nor Division II has any proposals that will reduce the size of their staff.

I respectfully urge your support in defeating this proposal.

Oscar C. Page (Austin Peay State University): As a member of the Presidents Commission, I want to clarify the point about sponsorship. The Presidents Commission is sponsoring this legislation. It is not opposing or supporting the legislation.

David B. Wagner (Georgia Southern University): I wish to speak in opposition of Proposal No. 32. Not to be redundant from what was stated about Proposal No. 87, but we are going to be restructured. That is evident. Restructuring means reduction of Division I-AA institutions. Our institutions have always been supported from institutional funds or student fees. We have a compassion and understanding for presidents who must take the lead and support our funding.

Some of us are in markets that permit us to ease those financial pressures by generating significant external funds. Some of us are not in markets that permit us to do this. Restructuring will undoubtedly change our market by reducing the number of members in Division I-A and enlarging the number of members in Division I-AA. As many as 26 members of Division I-A may find themselves in Division I-AA. The addition of 26 schools will increase our membership to 141 schools. With 141 member institutions, we have the opportunity to restructure to accommodate schools that have an opportunity to market themselves, generate external funds and put money into

their program as well as those schools that find it more cost effective to reduce their program costs. We may be able to handle the needs of both of those groups within our 141 schools. Restructuring has meant a reduction of Division I-A into a more homogeneous grouping. It could also mean a restructuring of Division I-AA into more homogeneous groupings.

I encourage you not to restructure our coaching staffs until we find out what is going to happen with restructuring overall.

[Proposal No. 32 (page A-51) was defeated by Division I-AA, 42-59, 18 abstentions.]

Off-Campus Recruiting—Division I Football

Judith M. Brame (University of California, Northridge): I move Proposal No. 31 on behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics recommended this legislation to limit the number of football coaches who can recruit off campus. It is the committee's belief that a limitation on the number of coaches who can recruit off campus will result in cost savings because the coaches who remain on campus will be able to perform other duties such as recruiting coordination, strength and conditioning, academic support and supervision, and counseling for student-athletes.

The legislation limits the number of coaches who can recruit off campus to the head coach and seven full-time assistants in Division I-A and a head coach and five full-time assistants in Division I-AA. The institution will certify those individuals who are permitted to recruit off campus and identify them by October 1 for a one-year period.

I urge your support of this legislation.

[Part B of Proposal No. 31 was defeated by Division I-AA, 37-67, 13 abstentions.]

Contacts and Evaluations—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): I move Proposal No. 33

[The motion was seconded.]

I urge the membership to make our recruiting calendar reflect that of Division I-A. We have got enough confusion out there now. As long as we can have similar recruiting calendars, I think it is in all of our best interests.

[Proposal No. 33 (page A-51) was adopted by Division I-AA, 93-24, one abstention.]

Official Visits—Division I Football and Basketball

Oscar C. Page (Austin Peay State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 38-A on behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics identified paid official visits to a member institution campus as a potentially costly element in recruiting. Accordingly, the committee recommended and the Council agreed to sponsor

legislation to reduce the permissible number of official visits in football from 70 to 56.

It is the committee's view that 56 is still a sufficient number to accommodate the recruiting needs of all Division I and I-AA members. In the Division I session, Part C of the legislation will be considered. If adopted, it will provide a waiver opportunity for an institution that has made a head coaching change after all or nearly all of the permitted official visits in the sport have been utilized.

I strongly urge your support of this legislation.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): We move Proposal No. 38-1 be ordered at this time to amend Proposal 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 38-1 would restore the 14 visits that would be removed by the main motion, but only for those institutions that do not subscribe to the letter of intent. It would provide those institutions the opportunity to have those visits after the letter of intent day for those students who were primarily trying to choose among that limited group of institutions.

This proposal was discussed in a number of Division I-AA caucuses this week. I hope it will enjoy this body's support.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): Proposal No. 38-1 specifies that a Division I institution that does not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent, "may provide 70 official visits in the sport of football, 56 of which may be provided prior to the initial National Letter of Intent signing date."

In cooperation with the Ivy League, we at NCA&T support Part No. 1 to Prop 38. It is our feeling that any institution that does not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent does not have a binding commitment from any prospect and therefore must recruit a greater number of prospects to yield the same number of incoming freshmen. The additional visits would occur after the National Letter of Intent signing date. To us, that's good common sense. It makes sense as far as legislation is concerned and certainly will provide Division I-AA institutions with an acceptable means to compete on a more even keel with Division I football powerhouses.

We therefore urge a vote of "yes" on Proposal 38-1.

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): I join Chancellor Fort in urging the membership to support the Ivy League's amendment. One of the strengths of Division I-AA has always been our ability to accommodate the members interested in diversity of our classification. We urge your support of this amendment.

[Proposal No. 38-1 (page A-68) was adopted by Division I-AA, 97-15, five abstentions.]

Ronald D. Stephenson (Big Sky Conference): Do you have the results of Proposal 38 in Division I-A?

Mr. Cohen: Proposal 38-A was adopted in Division I-A, 61 yes, 44 no, one abstention. Proposal 38-1 was adopted: 97 yes, 15 no, 5 abstentions. We are now ready to vote on Proposal 38-A as amended.

Kathy Clark (University of Idaho): Just a point of information. Currently, there is a difference in the number of scholarships in men's and women's basketball. Are we reading this correctly? Does the 12-event limitation in basketball apply to men's and women's basketball even though the scholarship level is different?

Mr. Cohen: That's correct. We are not voting on that, though. That will be in the Division I session. Seeing no one before the microphones, we are now ready to vote on Proposal 38 as amended.

[Part A of Proposal No. 38 (page A-67) was adopted as amended by Proposal No. 38-1 by Division I-AA, 91-23, five abstentions.]

Division I-AA Football—Preseason Squad Limit

Oscar Page (Austin Peay State University): I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 45 on behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics identified large football squads that assemble before the start of the academic year as a significant cost factor. Accordingly, that committee recommended and the Council and Presidents Commission agreed to sponsor this proposal to establish a limit of 90 student-athletes who may engage in practice activities before the institution's first day of classes or its first intercollegiate football contest, whichever occurs earlier. This limitation provides a number of opportunities for walk-on student-athletes while limiting the substantial cost related to housing and meals before the start of the academic year.

I urge your support of this proposal.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal 45-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 45-2 would remove the proposed cap of 90 for preseason football for those institutions that sponsor junior varsity teams that compete in at least four intercollegiate contests. We have been able over the years to adopt a policy in our league of permitting attendance at camp by any student, whether recruited or not, who wants to compete at a camp and have been able to provide a junior varsity program. Our academic calendars are such that most of our housing at most of our institutions takes place after the registration.

In any event, we would appreciate the opportunity to continue to provide this opportunity to participate. We hope the membership will pass Proposal 45-2.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): Speaking as the chair on the council of presidents and chancellors for the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference, we are in support of the position taken by the Ivy Group as associated with the amendment.

As indicated in the rationale statement: "Junior varsity contests traditionally start very close to the beginning of the varsity season. For safety reasons, these students (most of whom are freshman

and/or nonrecruited) must be given adequate time to prepare for competition."

We strongly urge the adoption of Proposal 45-2.

[Proposal No. 45-2 (page A-82) was adopted by Division I-AA, 93-18, six abstentions.]

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 45-3.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is intended to accommodate the group of Division I-AA institutions that were formerly Division III in football who continue to offer financial aid to their football players unrelated to athletics ability. The continued success of these programs is dependent upon their attracting as many walk-ons as possible.

Proposal 45-3 is essential to the continued success of these programs. It provides them a preseason squad limit of 110 instead of 90 with the understanding that they would also restrict the length of their preseason to 27 practice opportunities rather than 29.

For these reasons, I urge the membership's adoption of Proposal 45-3.

Donald E. Graham (Southland Conference): I urge that we be sensitive to the needs of our fellow members who sponsor need-based football programs and who are enrollment-driven. In order to be sure that they have adequate numbers, this amendment to the amendment is designed to give them some relief in that area. I urge your support of this proposal.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): The previous two speakers have spoken well. I urge your support of this. In Division I-AA, we need to be in support of diversity.

[Proposal No. 45-3 (page A-82) was adopted by Division I-AA, 91-25, two abstentions.]

Mr. Cohen: We're now ready to vote on 45 as amended by 45-2 and 3. Is there any further discussion?

[Proposal No. 45 (page A-80) was adopted as amended by 45-2 and 45-3 by Division I-AA, 92-22, five abstentions.]

Telephone Calls—Divisions I and II Football

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Football Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 41.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is one of a series of proposals recommended by the Legislative Review Committee and part of the effort to deregulate and simplify Bylaw 13.

This proposal will simplify current legislation relating to when telephone calls can be made to prospects in Division I-A and I-AA football in the past. It no longer will be necessary to "track" two recruiting calendars—one for when calls can be made and another calendar for when contacts can be made. The proposal will only require that institutions "track" the contact calendar.

During a contact period, prospects may be called at an institution's

discretion; outside the contact period, telephone calls may be made to a prospect only once per week.

On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 41 (page A-75) was adopted by Division I-AA, 118-0.]

Preseason Football Practice Seasons—Orientation Period

Oscar C. Page (Austin Peay State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 46 on behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

In reviewing issues related to the cost of operating intercollegiate athletics programs, the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics noted that the cost of providing housing, meals and support services to student-athletes before the start of the academic year resulted in significant expense. Nonetheless, the committee determined that it was important to retain adequate practice opportunities for student-athletes.

The committee identified the freshman orientation period before the start of preseason football practice as unnecessarily long. It was decided that the period could be shortened and costs reduced. Accordingly, the special committee recommended and the Council and Presidents Commission agreed to sponsor the legislation to reduce the freshman orientation from four days to two. It was noted that two days still provided an opportunity for an orientation program to familiarize incoming student-athletes with the institution academically as well as athletically before the large number of returning students begin practice.

I urge your support of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 46 (page A-83) was adopted by Division I-AA, 99-15, one abstention.]

Maximum Awards—Division I-AA Football

Gregory Sankey (Southland Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal 88.

[The motion was seconded.]

I want to make two brief points related to this issue to clarify some of the background related to Proposal 88.

In June of 1993, there was a great deal of discussion related to the legislative proposal that would have resulted in the reduction of awards in Division I-AA football to 45. Once it was determined that such a legislative proposal would be brought forward, the proposal to reduce to 55 was developed.

Proposal 88 was only offered as a compromise between our current award level and the significant reductions offered in Proposal 87. Speaking for the sponsoring institutions from the Southland Conference, I want to emphasize that there existed at that time and there still exists no desire to reduce grants from the current levels. In fact, all the sponsoring institutions from our conference that were involved with Proposal 88 will vote against this legislation.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): Proposal 88 is no less unsatisfactory than 87, which has already been defeated. We use the same reasons as identified earlier for opposition to Proposal No. 87.

To be very succinct, it's just simply bad legislation. It denigrates athletics competition as far as Division I-AA universities and colleges are concerned. It places these same campuses at an unfair disadvantage as compared with Division I-A schools and some Division II schools. Additionally, it brings into question the serious issue of access for minority kids.

We see no evidence that this legislation has any support from the majority of the CEO leadership within Division I-AA.

We are therefore urging in the strongest terms possible that we soundly defeat this legislation.

Paul H. Thompson (Weber State University): I spoke earlier about Proposal No. 87. One of the issues that has emerged since that discussion is that of access—the notion that by reducing scholarships we reduce access to college education.

There is a very different way to look at that. It costs us at Weber State about \$5,400 to provide the grant-in-aid for a football player. If that money is not used to provide grants-in-aid to a football player, —the aid that is involved here—we would save about \$43,000. That money, if we were not providing those scholarships to football players, could then be provided to other students. Because they are not practicing football 20 hours a week, they could work as well as have a scholarship. If I could use that \$43,000, I could provide 28 instead of eight scholarships.

By reducing the number of grants-in-aid in football, I can triple or quadruple the access to our institution by making those scholarships available. The best way to give access is to vote in favor of this motion.

Harold W. Lundy (Grambling State University): As stated earlier in regard to No. 87, those same reasons can be given for No. 88. It is an issue of access. This proposal limits access. We subscribe to the notion that if we err, let's err on the side of opportunity. To deny that many scholarships would deny access.

One writer said: "Give me neither poverty nor riches." We don't adhere to the idea that we subscribe to being in Division I. We don't want to go down to the level of a Division II school. Those institutions that do want to reduce their scholarships can do it at their discretion. We have argued since 1983 that we have to be very, very careful about the principle of general applicability.

You cannot impose the will of a specific or a few institutions out of many. For our conference, it would certainly denigrate our product. We have a reliable product. Our football program does in fact help us recruit some of the best and finest students in this country. For those reasons, I would urge defeat for No. 88, just as No. 87 was defeated.

John L. Allen (University of Connecticut): Proposal 88 represents

a compromise. It's a compromise that still requires a very significant hit in terms of access to higher education. For that reason alone, I would urge the delegates to oppose Proposal 88.

It has been mentioned that if 88 were passed, the cost savings would allow additional scholarships to be provided on a nonathletics basis. If all institutions encountering that situation would agree to award academic grants-in-aid to minority groups in proportion to the number of minority student-athletes who would be deprived of grants-in-aid if No. 88 passes, then I could possibly accept Proposal 88 more easily.

Since I don't think that would be the case, I very strongly urge you to defeat this proposal as you defeated Proposal 87.

Douglas B. Fullerton (Montana State University): I don't want to be accused of tilting at windmills, but I want to speak to the presidents and my colleagues. I think it's a very difficult issue for certain people to bring out. If you look at the number of scholarships given in Division I-AA, we have that number because it was issued with financial-distribution information. If you look at the sports sponsorship criteria, we, like they do in Division I-A, have a problem. The problem has nothing to do with cost reduction. It has to do with gender equity.

We have a problem, usually at the magnitude of 40 to 50 grants. We are all giving somewhere between 130 and 180 grants. Georgia Southern may be somewhere around 70 percent. That's pretty typical for people sponsoring football. If you just multiply those numbers out, we all have about a 40-grant problem.

A 40-grant problem on the women's side is going to cost us sometime in the next few years about \$400,000 a year per institution. There are two ways to solve it. You solve it by putting money in the program or you solve it with structure. I'm sure that Division I-A institutions in their restructuring efforts are looking to solve it with money. Division I-AA may be the only division that has a great opportunity to solve it with structure.

I tend to support 55 scholarships. At 55, you are the first group that could structurally get us to a 60-40 men-women split, which puts most of us in the range of our targets with a little tinkering. I don't know if 55 is ready to pass here; but, over the next few years I want you to keep in mind that Division I-AA will not have the money to solve this. We are going to have to solve it with structure. We may lose a few opportunities in men's football, that is true. It is a relative argument. Those opportunities may show up in women's softball.

Michael A. Ploszek (University of Maine): I rise in support of Proposal No. 88. If access is a question, then why aren't we suggesting that we increase scholarships. Access is the question for our entire institution, not simply for football. Competitiveness in Division I-A is a nonissue. We are Division I-AA. Let's look at I-AA as a classification and deal accordingly.

The issue here is cost. Cost for all of our institutions in a very dif-

ficult, troubling time that will not change any time soon. To support what Doug Fullerton said, gender equity is very much an issue. We must address this.

We have an opportunity with this legislation as a compromise to lead and not to follow. And what we always do is follow. What is everybody else doing? I would like to recommend that we lead today. Go to 55 and begin the restructuring that most definitely needs to take place within intercollegiate athletics.

David B. Wagner (Georgia Southern University): We all agreed that Title IX is indeed a threat to Division I-AA institutions in the Southeast. At this particular time, the only schools being investigated are Division I-AA institutions. We have problems. We must address those problems as best we can within our institutions.

We want to take the lead in restructuring. Restructuring is going on throughout Division I. I urge you to move with Division I with our restructuring and not move unilaterally. Don't wait to see what restructuring does to make any significant moves in our programs. I urge the defeat of Proposal 88.

Mr. Cohen: Owing to the lateness of the hour, this will probably be the last piece of legislation we will handle this morning.

[Proposal No. 88 (page A-123) was defeated by Division I-AA, 35-51, 31 abstentions.]

COMMENTS

David B. Wagner (Georgia Southern University): Let me take a minute this morning.

My purpose at this time is to inform you about the Division I-AA Athletic Directors Association, and to seek the support of I-AA presidents in our effort to protect the national interest of all Division I-AA institutions.

The I-AA Athletic Directors Association began at this Convention last year. At that time, we assigned officers and an executive committee, with representation from each I-AA conference and one at-large representative of our independent schools. Our executive committee met at the Final Four. We were represented by our president before the NCAA special committee on financial conditions. We met again as a group in May in Dallas and approved a statement of philosophy, structure and membership. It was determined at the May meeting that the association would provide the leadership for our annual I-AA meeting. We met again in June at the NACDA meeting, reviewed our May meeting and discussed our proposed legislation.

Throughout the year, we have worked in a truly compassionate way to learn to understand each other's needs, aspirations and fears. We are absolutely a bimodal distribution of schools. One mode restructured out of I-A, one mode out of Division III. There is little middle ground. To survive, we must have as much concern for others as ourselves.

The I-AA athletics directors feel strongly that I-AA has been underrepresented in national affairs. We have been stepchildren, orphans, thrown out of our original families and left on our own. Our big brothers booted us out of what is now I-A in 1978. Our little brothers were disowned by Division III in 1993. We have brothers and sisters from all status—social and political, elite through the Ivy and other leagues of private institutions, the politically strong, primary research state institutions.

The breadth of our regional service institutions is as wide as our proud athletics tradition. We have an exemplary record of service to our black community by our primarily black institutions. But we are not a family. It is time that we become one and begin to use the power of our 115 Division I members to direct our future. The I-AA Athletic Directors Association seeks to provide the leadership in organizing I-AA into a single voice at the national level.

Given the alternative to lead, follow or get out of the way, we wish to lead in the following actions: No. 1—To solicit the Joint Policy Board before March 1 to request that the I-AA Athletic Directors Association be a full participant in any restructuring process; No. 2—To solicit from our membership basic criteria that we all feel are essential to this process; No. 3—To develop a structure that will assure that the presidents of I-AA institutions are involved in any position taken by the association, and encourage our presidents to develop working relationships within each other; No. 4—To communicate clearly the association's positions and actions to our I-AA commissioners to assure that we are working for the benefit of the division on the same basis; and No. 5—To solicit active proportionate representation in our national association, including representation and involvement in leadership at the highest levels.

We seek your support in our effort. Our effort begins with a true compassion and understanding of each other's needs, aspirations and fears. Please commit with us to work together to assure that all I-AA institutions are represented at the national level in a clear, thorough and effective fashion. We ask your understanding and cooperation.

Thank you for this time.

Mr. Cohen: At this point, I would ask for adjournment.

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): Before adjournment, we have in our midst today the head football coach of the new Division I-AA national champions. It might be nice for this group to recognize coach Jim Trussell from Youngstown.

Mr. Cohen: We are adjourned until tomorrow morning.

[The Division I-AA business session was adjourned at 9:40 a.m.]

Tuesday Morning, January 11, 1994

[The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. with Mr. Cohen presiding.]

Mr. Cohen: The 1994 Division I-AA business session is now reconvened. The floor is now open for Proposal 90.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Financial Aid—Division I-AA Football

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors, we withdraw Proposal No. 90.

Mr. Cohen: Thank you.

Financial Aid—Division I-AA Football Exception

R. Elaine Dreidame (University of Dayton): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 89.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal was especially important for those Division I-AA football schools that are classified in I-AA because of the elimination of the multidivisional classification. Most of these schools now provide athletically related aid in football, although the student-athletes do receive some institutional aid. The receipt of such aid can cause recruited student-athletes to become counters under NCAA legislation, which could cause almost all recruited student-athletes to become counters, even when no athletically related aid is awarded.

This proposal would allow those Division I-AA programs that do not award any athletically related aid in football to be exempted from the initial and overall counter legislation.

On behalf of the Council, I urge you to support this proposal.

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): May I have a point of clarification from the sponsors of the proposal?

Speaking on behalf of a number of institutions to which Proposal 89 would apply, we want to be assured by the sponsors of the proposal that it is their intent that it would not impact negatively against those low-cost football programs that Elaine referred to, that may have one or two dual-sport athletes who may be participating in a football program.

Ms. Dreidame: We did check with legislative services. That is our intent.

[Proposal No. 89 (page A-124) was adopted by Division I-AA.]

Spring Football Practice—Divisions I-A and I-AA

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Football Conference): I move for the adoption of Proposal 112.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 112 (page A-151) was adopted by Division I-AA.]

Spring Football Practice—Divisions I-A and I-AA

Wright Waters: On behalf of the sponsors, we move Proposal No. 113.

[The motion was seconded.]

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Football Conference): In the fourth column, I would like to point out that the Council has withdrawn its support for this legislation, despite what is reported in the Convention Notice. That is due to the fact that the competitive safeguards committee sent us some research data indicating that the incidence of injury is higher in the spring season.

Kathy Clark (University of Idaho): Speaking on behalf of the competitive safeguards committee, I rise in opposition to Proposal 113 on behalf of the committee. Spring football has significantly higher practice injury rates than fall football. This rate of injuries has been tempered somewhat by reducing the number of contact days during that period.

Division I institutions currently have the discretion to determine the practice activities that may occur during spring football noncontact sessions, provided no football gear or protective equipment other than head gear, shoes, pants and lightweight jerseys are worn by student-athletes. A relevant NCAA interpretation allowed institutional discretion to include approving the use of blocking dummies.

The competitive safeguards committee strongly believes that if the use of blocking dummies is a safety issue, then the discretionary use of these devices in noncontact practices should be reevaluated and curtailed, rather than encouraged by allowing more protective equipment. Safety in a noncontact practice is best maintained by following the spirit of the noncontact designation.

Please join the NCAA sports safety committee in opposing this legislation. Allowing the use of shoulder pads on noncontact days will serve to increase practice intensity and contact, and thereby increase the injury rates.

Claudius Watts (The Citadel): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I speak in support of this proposal. We believe it simply specifies what protective football gear and equipment can be utilized by student-athletes while participating in noncontact sessions during spring football practice.

Mr. Cohen: Just to clarify the issue, the Council did not oppose it, but it did withdraw support of the proposal. I know it sounds confusing, but the Council is not supporting this proposal.

[Proposal No. 113 (page A-152) was adopted by Division I-AA.]

Meals During Unofficial Visits—Division I-AA Football

R. Elaine Dreidame (University of Dayton): On behalf of the Council, I move for the adoption of Proposal 142.

[The motion was seconded.]

As indicated in the rationale statement for this proposal, many Division I-AA football programs—commonly those that were classified in Division III football before last year—offer financial aid solely on the basis of need. Because of this, it is necessary to attract large numbers of prospects to visit the campus. It makes sense to allow these types of institutions that do not give more than 25 official visits to provide on-campus meals to prospects and their parents without having to count that as an official visit.

This proposal also would require the institution to have a policy of providing such meals to the parent of any prospective student visiting the campus.

On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 142 (page A-177) was adopted by Division I-AA.]

CLOSING COMMENTS

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): Yesterday, we passed Proposal No. 45 as amended by 45-3. There is some confusion about the intent. We wondered if we could ask the sponsors if it was the intent of 45-3 to only address nonscholarship programs.

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I can assure you that the original intent of that proposal was to limit its application to the so-called low-cost football program.

Mr. Waters: Thank you. I think it would be appropriate to forward that to the Council to review in their post-Convention meeting.

Mr. Cohen: It will be done.

Are there any other issues that you would like to be brought up concerning Division I-AA? Are there any other proposals you would like to discuss in Division I?

I will take a motion for adjournment. We are adjourned.

[The Division I-AA business session was adjourned at 8:15 a.m.]

☐ Division I-AAA Business Session

Monday Morning, January 10, 1994

The Division I-AAA business session was called to order at 8 a.m. by Chris Monasch, Northeast Conference.

[Note: Because no votes were taken in the session, the following is a summary of the discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

OPENING REMARKS

Chair Monasch welcomed the delegates and introduced Council members. He invited delegates to discuss any proposals.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The delegates discussed various proposals to be voted on at the Division I business session.

The delegates were told that the Presidents Commission and Council supported Proposal No. 27-1, which would extend the time a restricted-earnings coach can stay at his or her institution to five years. The delegates also were asked to note that Proposal No. 25, which eliminates the limitations on summer compensation that a restricted-earnings coach may receive, was not supported by the Council. A straw vote indicated that the delegates opposed the proposal.

A straw vote on Proposal No. 42 indicated that the delegates were opposed to the legislation, which called for a reinstatement of the grant-in-aid limitation of 14 in Division I men's basketball. Considerable discussion about the proposal ensued. Proponents of the proposal cited access for ethnic minorities as a major reason to vote for the proposal while opponents of the proposal indicated the proposal should be voted down for cost-containment reasons.

The group was urged by one delegate to vote in favor of Proposal No. 142, legislation that would require schools to determine on an annual basis all athletically related revenues and expenditures on a standardized reporting form.

The delegates also were asked to support Resolution No. 174, which would review how well student-athletes were prepared for initial-eligibility academic standards.

[The Division I-AAA business session was adjourned at 8:42 a.m.]

☐ Division II Business Session

Monday Morning, January 10, 1994

The Division II business session was called to order at 8 a.m., with Division II Vice-President Charles N. Lindemann, athletics director at Humboldt State University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Lindemann: Welcome everyone. I have had the pleasure of serving as vice-president for the Division II Steering Committee for this last year, and barring war or pestilence, I am hopeful I will have the position for one more year.

This is our first of two Division II business sessions. This one is scheduled to go until one o'clock today. We are scheduled to reconvene tomorrow morning at 8 a.m. We will be functioning under Robert's Rules of Order. Our parliamentarian is Paul Engelmann, professor of economics from Central Missouri State University. In our parliamentarian's meetings yesterday, Mr. Chapman was referred to as the general parliamentarian. I asked Paul what his designation ought to be. He told me a private first class, but having seen him in action, I think his designation is probably somewhat higher than that.

[Note: Various introductions and other announcements were made and voting instructions were given.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Lindemann: Before we begin voting, it has been traditional in the Division II business session to review legislative proposals. This year, various members of the steering committee and Grand Valley State University President, Don Lubbers, chair of the Division II subcommittee of the Presidents Commission, have been asked to summarize groups of proposals that relate to Division II. This will give you an opportunity to ask questions or to pursue additional information about any proposal. This is not the time, however, to begin debate. With that, I will call upon Don to come forward to present the presidential grouping.

Presidents Commission Grouping

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): Thank you, Chuck, and thank you colleagues. It has been a great experience for me to serve on the Presidents Commission. I was fortunate to be on the Commission when it was formed several years ago. It has been one of the most interesting experiences of my professional life.

The Presidents Commission has designated 43 proposals to be considered during today's session. These proposals have been grouped together because the Commission believes that they are very important and they are very important. The chief executive officers have suggested that you support them.

Although I will not attempt to provide you with the details of each proposal, it is important to know that these proposals are directly related to the intended objectives of the reform movement. In some instances, the proposals will further the objectives of the reform movement and are sponsored or supported by the Presidents Commission.

Proposals sponsored by the Presidents Commission are identified with an asterisk before the proposal number. In other instances, the proposal is contrary to the goals of the reform movement.

Proposals included in the grouping that may be of particular interest to Division II include:

- Two proposals related to gender equity that are being sponsored by the Presidents Commission and the Council at the recommendation of the Gender-Equity Task Force.
- A Proposal to establish a three-year professional membership category for prospective NCAA member institutions.
- A resolution to direct the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism to report on the issue of need-based financial aid at the 1995 Convention with a view toward submitting appropriate legislation for consideration by the membership not later than 1996 Convention.
- A proposal to permit student-athletes in Divisions I and II to engage in five seasons of intercollegiate competition within the appropriate applicable eligibility period. This proposal is opposed by both the Council and the Presidents Commission.
- Several proposals relating specifically to the issue of cost reduction—one of the primary objectives of the reform movement.

Although only a handful of proposals in the grouping relate directly to Division II, those proposals could have significant impact on the operation of our athletics programs as well as the eligibility of our student-athletes in future years. Those are just a few comments about the Presidents Commission recommendations. If you have any questions, I will try to answer them; or Asa Green, our consultant, will answer them or Chuck Lindemann, who is the best informed of all, will answer them.

Mr. Lindemann: Next up is Dorothy Dreyer, who will provide information about the membership proposals.

Membership

Dorothy E. Dreyer (Wayne State University, Michigan): Good morning. There are a few proposals, all of which are included in the Presidents Commission grouping that involve issues that relate to Division II membership. The most significant of these is Proposal No. 14. I might also add it is the longest. It just took a long time to change everything to get down to what I am going to tell you.

Proposal 14 was developed after discussions in both Division II

and Division III Steering Committees about the number of institutions that were joining the NCAA and the concerns about those institutions' preparedness to meet NCAA requirements and their ability to continue to comply with NCAA rules and regulations.

In some instances, there were concerns about whether these institutions had the commitment to support the principles and the philosophy statements of the two respective divisions. In the past five years, we have elected 66 Division II active members. Ninety-seven percent of those members received waivers of division criteria in order to gain NCAA membership. Forty-five percent are currently eligible for championship competition. This proposal, long as it is, simply establishes a three-year provisional membership before election to active membership. It eliminates waivers of division criteria and establishes a five-year period for championship eligibility; the three years as a provisional member plus two years after that as an active member.

During the first year of provisional membership, an institution would not be required to apply NCAA rules or regulations. The year is designed to be an orientation period in which the institution would receive all the official forms, publications and general information from the national office regarding the requirements and activities of the association. The institution would be required to attend the annual NCAA Convention as well as other meetings such as conference or NCAA seminars regarding NCAA legislation. Upon completion of the first year of provisional membership, the institution would be required to apply all NCAA rules and regulations without waiver opportunities other than in very limited situations beyond the control of the member.

At the end of the three-year provisional membership, the institution would be eligible for election to active membership by the Division II Steering Committee. A two-year period of active membership would be required for NCAA championship eligibility. This proposal is effective September 2, 1994. It will have no effect on those institutions applying for active membership effective September 1, 1994. So that's a long proposal and that is what it boils down to.

In addition, the membership will be voting on Proposal 13, which is related to the NCAA membership structure. The resolution was proposed by the Council and Presidents Commission. It was a result of input received from various membership constituencies that expressed interest in alternative membership structures that might better address the financial conditions that negatively impact higher education in intercollegiate athletics and would provide greater program-wide homogeneity within voting membership classifications and would assist institutions in their commitment to providing gender-equity within their athletics program.

It should be noted that currently the NCAA Joint Policy Board has appointed a special committee to review this issue and has charged the committee to solicit advice from the membership regarding new

models related to membership structure. The resolution will direct this special committee after appropriate review and dialogue to present the most acceptable models to the membership for review for action and possibly action at the 1995 Convention with final action not later than the 1996 Convention.

Finally, the Gulf South Conference is sponsoring Proposal 15, which would establish a two-year notification requirement for institutions that intend to reclassify from Division II to Division I. The notice must be received in the national office no later than June 1 two years before the September 1 when the institution intends to reclassify in Division I. There are exceptions to the notification requirement for institutions petitioning not later than June 1, 1994, to reclassify from Division II to Division I, effective not later than September 1, 1995. Institutions that have forwarded notice of intention to reclassify to Division I or that have petitioned to reclassify to Division I, will not be eligible to participate in any subsequent Division II NCAA championship.

Please note that the Division II Steering Committee supports the Gulf South Conference proposal. If you have questions on that one, ask Harold McGee. If there are any other questions, we will be delighted to try to answer them.

Mr. Lindemann: Rich Johanningmeier will address the enforcement proposal and legislative review deregulation package.

Enforcement and Legislative Review Deregulation

Richard A. Johanningmeier (Washburn University of Topeka): Thank you, Chuck. Proposals Nos. 152 through 156, which modify the penalty structure for infraction cases, will be considered by the membership. These proposals are listed in the enforcement grouping and are being sponsored by the Council at the recommendation of the Special Committee to Review the NCAA Penalty Structure.

Among the proposals is an amendment to establish a presumptive as opposed to a prescribed minimal penalty for major violations that would eliminate the necessity of finding uniqueness as a requirement for not imposing the minimum prescribed penalties. The special committee recommended eliminating the uniqueness provision because of confusion and criticism that resulted when the NCAA Committee on Infractions attempted to justify its actions in unique cases. A list of presumptive penalties will guide the committee but also permit it to design penalties that directly address the abuses found in each case without having to justify the case as unique.

Further, the list of presumptive penalties has been modified somewhat to more accurately reflect the range of penalties that generally have been imposed by the Committee on Infractions when institutions are involved in major violations. The presumptive penalties will provide the Committee on Infractions with greater flexibility in considering appropriate penalties to impose upon an institution's program when student-athletes currently attending the institution are not involved in the violation.

Other proposals resulting from the special committee's work include a proposal to enact a mission statement listing objectives of the NCAA enforcement program and a proposal to provide the Committee on Infractions with greater flexibility in dealing with secondary violations by permitting it to accept penalties developed by an institution or conference as well as to impose any of the specifically listed disciplinary measures.

Also in the Presidents Commission grouping is Proposal No. 21, which was recommended by the ad hoc committee to study enforcement issues to permit the Committee on Infractions to refer a case or part of a case involving major infractions to an independent hearing officer who will review disputed facts. The independent hearing officer will present the findings of fact concerning alleged violations to the Committee on Infractions and the parties who participate in the hearing. It is the committee's belief that the use of an independent jurist to resolve disputed facts will enhance the public's perception of fairness and confidence in the enforcement process.

If you have any specific questions regarding these proposals, I will be happy to respond to them. Does anyone have questions regarding the enforcement proposals? Seeing none, we will move on to the deregulation package that is being sponsored by the Legislative Review Committee.

The Legislative Review Committee has identified several proposals designed to facilitate the deregulation of the Association's recruiting legislation. The Council has approved the submission of these proposals to the membership as a deregulation package. Please note that although these proposals are being submitted as a package, they will be voted on separately in the business sessions. Further, two of the proposals that are part of the package that affect Division II appear in the Presidents Commission grouping as Proposals Nos. 40 and 41.

Among the proposals to be considered as part of the package that affect Division II include:

- A proposal to simplify the definition of a recruited prospect by establishing an all inclusive list of activities that constitutes recruitment.
- A proposal to eliminate the once-per-week limitation on visits to a prospect's institution.
- A proposal to eliminate the restrictions on contacting a prospect's parent before a contest on the day or days of competition.
- A proposal to eliminate the once-per-week restriction on telephone calls to prospects in sports other than football and basketball.
- A proposal to eliminate restrictions on recruiting publicity in sports other than football and basketball.
- A proposal to eliminate the prohibition against senior prospects attending member institution camps or clinics.

The proposals that seek action ranging from the simplification of the committee's legislation to eliminating provisions deemed unne-

essary or obsolete are the first in a series of what the Legislative Review Committee anticipates to be a five-year effort to review various bylaws for deregulation opportunities. If you have any questions regarding any specific proposals, I'd be happy to respond to them at this time.

Mr. Lindemann: You get the feeling we all have the same speech writer. I think Rich did a fine job. Harold McGee will speak to the gender-equity proposals.

Gender Equity

Harold J. McGee (Jacksonville State University): Good morning. As many of you know, the Council-appointed Gender-Equity Task Force recently released a report designed to provide appropriate guidance to member institutions to enhance their compliance with applicable Federal and state gender-equity legislation.

Although the report was primarily couched in the form of guidelines, two legislative proposals were recommended by the task force to the membership to be voted on as legislation at this Convention. The Presidents Commission and the Council have jointly sponsored the two proposals. They appear as the first two items in the Presidents Commission grouping—Nos. 11 and 12.

Proposal No. 11 would establish a principle of gender equity in the Association's principles for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics. It is the task force's opinion that the Association assert the value of equitable participation and treatment of men and women in intercollegiate athletics through its structure, programs, legislation and policies. The task force strongly believes it is necessary to formulate and codify a basic principle related to gender equity to provide guidance to members of the Association as they enact legislation that governs the operation of their athletics programs.

In addition, Proposal No. 12 would establish maximum financial-aid limits in emerging sports for women and permit institutions to utilize such sports in order to meet the Association's minimum sports-sponsorship and financial-aid award criteria. The intent of the legislation is to encourage institutions to sponsor emerging sports in an effort to provide additional opportunities for participation in intercollegiate athletics to female student-athletes. It should be noted that the Division II Steering Committee is sponsoring an amendment to the proposal to preclude Division II institution from using emerging sports to meet minimum sponsorship requirements.

The Division II Steering Committee is very much in support of the idea of providing additional opportunities for female student-athletes; however, it expressed concern that the use of emerging sports for female student-athletes should supplement and not supplant the opportunity to participate in the traditional sports programs that we sponsor. If you have any questions or positive comments about gender equity, they come to me. Negative ones go to Dorothy Dreyer.

Mr. Lindemann: Our final speaker in this segment will be David O'Toole, who will provide information regarding proposals recom-

mended by a special committee to review financial conditions.

Financial Conditions

David O'Toole (Bellarmine College): Good morning. A group of 14 proposals plus 11 amendments-to-amendments will deal with recommendations of the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics.

As the name of the special committee would indicate, the proposals in this grouping are an attempt to address some of the financial concerns that currently exist in intercollegiate athletics. It is worth noting that only a few of these proposals relate directly to Division II. Among the proposals is a resolution to mandate further study of the Association's membership structure, need-based financial aid and the concept of establishing a biannual legislative Convention. Another proposal places limits on travel-squad size for team trips involving an overnight stay or air travel. Note that the membership has submitted several amendments-to-amendments to this proposal.

Another proposal requires all athletics staff members to obtain prior written approval from chief executive officers for athletically related outside income and benefits and to report the sources and the amount of income in writing. Most of the other proposals in the groupings attempt to address concerns that appear to be specific to Division II only.

If you have any specific questions, I'll be glad to try to answer them.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Lindemann: Are we ready to get started? I need to let you know that per action that was taken in the general session yesterday, the agenda has been reordered. The deregulation package has been moved back into its numerical sequence at the end of numerical order so that proposals numbered in the 160s and 170s will now appear at the end, and Proposal No. 96 will be proposed before No. 47 in this session. We will begin with proposal No. 12.

Sports Sponsorship—Emerging Sports For Women

Diane T. Wendt (University of Denver): On behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 12.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to establish maximum financial aid limits in identified emerging sports for women and permit institutions to use these sports to meet the Association's minimum sports sponsorship and financial-aid award criteria.

The Gender-Equity Task Force identified specific emerging sports for women in hopes of fostering an environment in which greater opportunities for female student-athletes to participate in intercollegiate athletics can be achieved. The task force identified nine new sports—archery, badminton, bowling, crew, ice hockey, squash, synchronized swimming, team handball and water polo—that may be

used by institutions to meet sports-sponsorship criteria.

It also is important to note that the legislation provides flexibility for the Council to periodically identify future emerging sports for women. I urge you to support Proposal No. 12.

Mr. Lindemann: I would note two things for you folks. Number one, there is an interpretation on this particular proposal that you will find on your blue sheets. Also note that we are voting in this session on sections A, C and H on proposal No. 12.

Ms. Dreyer: On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 12-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal No. 12 unamended is to permit an institution to meet the Division II sports sponsorship requirement by sponsoring as few as two existing traditional sports in which the Association conducts championships.

Under such circumstances, it is arguable that any objective of assisting institutions in providing greater participation opportunity for its female student-athletes as well as complying with the applicable gender-equity laws may be advanced. Proposal 12-1 will preclude a Division II institution from using an identified emerging sport to meet minimum sports sponsorship requirements.

Although the Division II Steering Committee is unanimous in its support for creating greater opportunity for participation of female students, it is the committee's opinion that the use of emerging sports to provide greater participation opportunities for female students should—Harold stole this line from me—supplement and not supplant the opportunity to participate in existing sports. I urge you to support Proposal No. 12-1.

[Proposal No. 12-1 (page A-15) was adopted by Division II, 191-12.]

[Parts A, C and H of Proposal No. 12 (page A-10) as amended by No. 12-1 were adopted by Division II, 187-6.]

Change of Division Membership— Notification and Championships Eligibility

Robert L. Potts (University of North Alabama): On behalf of the 11 members of the Gulf South Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 15.

[The motion was seconded.]

As explained earlier, this proposal requires a two-year notification requirement for reclassification from Division II to Division I. It also makes an institution ineligible for championships after the notification has been given in writing.

The basic rationale for this is one of fairness. We do not feel that it is fair for a Division II institution to continue to compete for championships. Once they receive the recruiting advantage, they begin to raise funds to go to Division I. We feel this is a proposal that should be adopted. It is supported by the Presidents Commission.

Dorothy E. Dreyer (Wayne State University, Michigan): On be-

half of the Division II Steering Committee, I speak in support of Proposal 15.

Originally, the steering committee took no position on this proposal because it did not require a date by which a Division II institution would have to declare its intent to move to Division I. Further, the steering committee expressed concern regarding the effect of an immediate effective date upon those Division II institutions that already have notified the national office of their intent to move to Division I effective September 1, 1994.

After these concerns were expressed, the Gulf South Conference, which sponsors the proposal, addressed those concerns.

If a Division II institution intends to petition for reclassification to Division I, it must submit written notice of its intention to be received in the national office not later than June 1 two years before the September 1 when the institution intends to reclassify in Division I. Further, a Division II institution that has forwarded to the national office written notice of its intention to change membership classification to Division I or has petitioned to reclassify to Division I no longer shall be eligible to participate in any subsequent Division II NCAA championships. Because of the concerns expressed by the steering committee, these concerns have been addressed. The committee urges you to support proposal No. 15.

James J. Sims (University of California, Riverside): We are opposed to this proposal mainly because of the issue of fairness. We see it as unfair to exclude a member of the NCAA from any championship possibilities simply because they want to change divisions. We have two examples in the California Collegiate Athletic Association in the last few years that have made this transition, stayed in our conference and played for our championships. It did not make a major impact or become a monster because they went this way. In fact, they have been weakened each time.

We may make this transition ourselves. We think that it would be fair to leave us the possibility of being involved in a championship. I urge your defeat of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 15 (page A-26) was adopted by Division II, 159-25, two abstentions.]

Eligibility—Seasons of Competition

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

I recognize that this is rather radical for some people, but I want to remind you that some 24 years ago they also moved with a proposal to allow individuals to compete for four years. Although this may need some fine tuning—that may sound familiar to you because we have been doing a lot of that lately—I think it is important that we not be driven by the media paranoia that surrounds Division I and we do what's right. I believe this is right.

I understand that there is some desire to study this issue. I would

have hoped that you would have done that before today. Let me suggest that you talk to your student-athlete advisory committee on your campus and find out how difficult it's become for individuals to get classes to graduate in four years.

In addition, you might like to, as I did, talk to our institutional research director who graduated some 25 years ago and said: "Jim, I would not want to be going to school today with the information that you have to know, the information you have to learn, it's a different ball game than it was when you and I were going to school."

We have a commitment to individuals who matriculate at our institutions. I don't think we should be casting the student-athlete aside. If your institution is like ours, the average grant-in-aid award is about \$2,700 or about one-third of what it costs to attend the University of Northern Colorado. Those who complete their degree work in four years would have to give serious consideration of trying to compete for a fifth year at the cost of nearly \$5,000. We have not seen it in the past. I don't think you will see it in the future.

At our institution, if you eliminate three sports—two women's and one men's sport—where there is a larger percentage of full rides given, the average award is closer to \$2,200. Many of us currently discriminate on our campus against the student-athlete. I don't know whether you realize that or not. The band members and the performing arts students can receive their performance awards for five, even six years providing they stay in good academic standing. We do not move to provide the same for the student-athletes or the CEO is going back to the campuses and setting up the same limits for those same individuals in those other programs.

I found it interesting last night at the honors dinner that Charles Osgood made mention that the Association is in many ways a leader in social concerns. Stop and think about what we are doing—especially Division II members. This is an opportunity for us to make a statement to our society and perhaps even family structure. Let's do what's best for our student-athletes and assist them, help them finish the task, do what we need to do, maybe the message will be clear that we need to finish molding things before we go on and bring new people in.

I think we have an obligation to these young men and women. I think we need to fulfill that obligation. As I said at the onset, I do believe there is some fine tuning to this. Let me also say this. If we don't succeed this year, I do hope that we will try again as we do on the athletics field and succeed next year.

Raymond L. Orbach (University of California, Riverside): I oppose Proposal No. 17. I do so on the basis of the arguments presented by the Presidents Commission. But I would also like to add another argument. Universities across the country are moving toward four years for graduation. In fact, there are some universities proposing three years for a baccalaureate degree when hours are not sufficient for graduating in four years.

The pressure on all of us, especially at state-supported and private institutions will be to get those courses offered so that students can graduate in four years. We are moving toward this limit for financial reasons. This action would move exactly in the wrong direction.

Mr. Lindemann: Thank you. We do have some late-breaking news about Proposal No. 17. It appears that it is going to be withdrawn in Division I. Members in that division are going to be asked to support Proposal No. 18.

Rodney C. Kelchner (Mansfield University of Pennsylvania): I am speaking in opposition to Proposal 17 on behalf of the Commission and the Council for reasons that have already been stated.

We believe that this sends the wrong signal. It puts an increased emphasis on athletics participation rather than on academic participation. We urge the defeat of this proposal.

[Parts A, B and D of Proposal No. 17 (page A-28) were defeated by Division II, 34-168, three abstentions. Parts C and D were withdrawn.]

Expenses—Travel-Squad Size Limitations

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): I move Proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council and Presidents Commission have sponsored Proposal No. 23 in order to permit the Divisions I and II membership to consider the proposal, but they have not taken a position in support of or opposition to the legislation.

This proposal was submitted by the Pacific-10 Conference for consideration at the 1993 Convention. It was withdrawn at the request of the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics to permit that committee to review the travel-squad limitations. It was among the issues it considered in developing cost-reducing legislation.

At the conclusion of its review, the special committee decided to support the legislation. After considering concerns about whether national legislation was necessary on this subject and the actual costs that would be saved, the Council and Commission decided not to specifically support this legislation. Accordingly, it is submitted for the delegates' determination of whether this legislation should be adopted.

Delegates should note the official interpretations of Proposal No. 23. The interpretation that affirms that these limitations apply only to regular-season varsity competition makes Proposal No. 23-4 unnecessary.

Doug Echols (South Atlantic Conference): Proposal No. 23 will impose national legislation on travel-squad size. Such a restriction should be handled at the institutional or conference level. All eight members of the South Atlantic Conference oppose this proposal although we acknowledge that some of our colleagues in Division II have various geographical and financial consideration in relationship

to restricting travel-squad size. This option is open to you without a national mandate.

Many of our Division II programs are dependent upon walk-ons and minimal athletics aid to student-athletes whose primary motivation for participating is to be a part of the team. This certainly means the opportunity to not only practice, but to travel and be available to get into the game and be a full participant. Additionally, many smaller Division II athletics programs are an integral part of enhancing enrollment by providing opportunities for athletics involvement.

To restrict athletics participation by limiting the number of players who can travel—even if it is for an overnight stay—would place additional burden on these athletics programs that work to maximize these opportunities for participation. By voting “no” on Proposal No. 23 and the associated amendment, you will also be acknowledging a recognition for less national restrictions in an area that your institution or conference collectively can decide what might be appropriate.

There are no competitive or ethical reasons to have these restrictions on a national scale. You are encouraged to vote “no” on Proposal 23 and all the associated amendments.

Clint Bryant (Augusta College). I move Proposal 23-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move this proposal on behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission. The Council sponsored Proposal No. 23-2 because it believes that a travel-squad limitation of 13 in basketball is more appropriate than a limit of 12.

Terry Wanless (University of North Dakota): I speak against Proposal No. 23-2. While it makes sense in Division I because you have 13 full scholarships, we are at 10 in Division II. There is no correlation between 13 and 10 the way I see it. I would support it if I were in Division I, but I don't think it should be supported in Division II.

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): The person who moved No. 23-2 said it was supported by the Presidents Commission. That's not my understanding. Can we get clarification on that? It is not supported by the Presidents Commission.

Secondly, I support the earlier speaker's comments. It is an institutional and a conference issue. For Fort Hays, coming out of the plains to play over a three-day period or back-to-back basketball or baseball games, we need to take extra players.

Our conference tries to take that into consideration in establishing our conference limitation. I think it places a hardship on athletics to try to pass such legislation that would impact all areas of the country equally. I leave it up to the conferences.

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): A point of information. Ed, you asked about the Presidents Commission. The Presidents Commission did not support or oppose it. The Commission decided to take no action in terms of support or action.

Mr. Hammond: That was my understanding. It isn't supported by the Presidents Commission.

Mr. Bryant: I too agree that even though in Division II, where we are moving toward the 10 scholarship limit based on participation, institutions last year in men's basketball had a 14.76 participation rate. In Division II women's basketball, there was a 13.67 rate.

Don't hold me to the percentages, but it was close to being 15 on men's basketball and 13 in women's basketball.

[Proposal No. 23-2 (page A-40) was defeated by Division II, 50-154, two abstentions.]

Joseph B. Oxendine (Pembroke State University): I speak in support of No. 23 because I think this allowance does not provide a competitive advantage for any institution when you go from 12 to 13 players. It is really not a competitive advantage. In addition, I think the cost saving is very minimal from our standpoint. I believe it gives flexibility that ought to rest with the institution.

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I move Proposal No. 23-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think this gives us some flexibility. Some of the numbers that have been proposed have some benefit for Division II, particularly in the sense that we can make some decisions on our own campuses to increase—particularly on the women's side—some of the participation and travel to contests away from home and overnight. We can make those decisions. I don't think the numbers are unreasonable.

[Proposal No. 23-1 (page A-39) was defeated by Division II, 61-149, one abstention.]

[Proposal No. 23 (page A-38) was defeated by Division II, 99-104, one abstention.]

Athletically Related Income

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): I move Proposal No. 28 on behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics developed this proposal to affirm the requirements of Bylaw 11.3.1, which states that the institution shall remain in control of who is to be its employee and the amount of salary the employee is to receive within the restrictions specified by NCAA legislation.

The Council and Presidents Commission supported this legislation to establish further control of athletically related income by requiring that all athletics department staff members other than secretarial and clerical personnel must receive prior written approval from the institution's CEO for all athletically related income and benefits from sources outside the institution.

The other substantive change in the legislation is to require that the staff member's request for formal approval must be in writing and must include the amount and the source of the income. The pro-

posal retains the opportunity for the CEO to grant general prior written approval for a staff member to receive income that does not exceed \$500 for speaking engagements or for participation in camps or clinics; however, even in those instances, the staff member must provide a detailed accounting of all such amounts under \$500 to the CEO.

The Council and Commission believe that the more detailed information required by this legislation will provide the institution's chief executive with what he or she needs to fully understand and control compensation paid to athletics department staff members.

[Proposal No. 28 (page A-47) was adopted by Division II, 158-49, three abstentions.]

Recruiting Materials

Richard A. Johanninger (Washburn University of Topeka). On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee, the Council and the Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 40.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is one in a series of proposals being sponsored in an effort to deregulate and simplify the NCAA Manual.

As indicated in the rationale statement, the area of printed recruiting materials is arguably one of the most over-regulated and at times confusing areas within NCAA recruiting legislation. The idea of putting restrictions on the recruiting materials that can and cannot be sent to prospects originated as a way to save money. However, some institutions contend that in many cases the legislation has added rather than reduced expenditures. The legislation also has led to a number of additional interpretations being issued and a number of pages being added to the Manual.

This proposal significantly reduces the list of permissible recruiting materials and eliminates the list of nonpermissible recruiting materials. Accordingly, if an item is not on a permissible list, it cannot be sent to a prospect. This proposal greatly reduces what has been massive and complex legislation. I urge you to vote for deregulation and simplification by voting "yes" on Proposal No. 40.

[Proposal No. 40 (page A-70) was adopted by Division II, 191-19.]

Telephone Calls—Divisions I and II Football

Mr. Johanninger: On behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 41.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is another in a series of proposals recommended by the Legislative Review Committee as part of the effort to deregulate and simplify Bylaw 13.

If this proposal is adopted by Divisions I-A, I-AA and II, everyone will have the same limitations on when prospects can and cannot be contacted by telephone. The proposal is simple. During a contact period, prospects may be called at the institution's discretion. However, outside a contact period, telephone calls can be made to a prospect

only once a week. The proposal retains some restrictions on when telephone calls can be made, which many people think are necessary so as not to unduly interfere with a prospect's life, but does not establish a complicated calendar that institutions have to monitor and track.

On behalf of the Council and Commission, I urge you to adopt this proposal.

Mr. Lindemann: Please note this is a football only proposal. Only those institutions that sponsor football are entitled to vote. The rest of you will be locked out of the voting line on this one.

[Proposal No. 41 (page A-75) was adopted by Division II, 128-6.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Division II

Janet R. Kittell (California State University, Chico): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to permit athletics department staff members to participate in eight hours of skill-related workouts with student-athletes outside of the team's designated playing and practice season during the academic year. It also would limit the unsupervised use of an institution's athletics facilities by student-athletes during the academic year and eliminate the safety exception for all sports.

In 1991, the NCAA adopted legislation as part of the reform package to reduce the time demands on student-athletes. The Division II Steering Committee believes that this proposal is consistent with the spirit of the original legislation and will also provide an opportunity to deregulate the current application of the rule. This proposal will allow coaches and student-athletes to work together in skill-related activities during off hours that currently are restricted only to conditioning activities. It is intended to provide greater flexibility and to permit student-athletes and coaches with more realistic time to prepare for athletics competition without increasing the time that a coach may be involved directly with his or her student-athletes outside the playing season.

Further, this proposal eliminates the need for sport-by-sport exceptions by recognizing that all student-athletes want to improve their abilities rather than spend extra time on strength and conditioning. It will allow coaches in all sports to be involved for safety reasons for up to eight hours outside the playing and practice season.

Finally, the steering committee believes that reserving facilities for unsupervised workouts imposes an unnecessary liability risk on the institution and will no longer be necessary once coaches can work with student-athletes during these eight hours.

I urge you to adopt Proposal 96.

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): After the CEO forum yesterday and some discussion of Proposal No. 96, the executive committee of the Presidents Commission voted to support

it. No position had been taken previously, but after the discussion it was voted to support it favorably.

Kathy Argo (San Francisco State University): Speaking for the Northern California Athletic Conference Volleyball Coaches, we would urge your support of this proposal. Currently the eight hour limitation per week precludes any skill development work with our athletes outside of the 22-week playing season in Division II.

Although our student-athletes are not always the top performers in their sport when they come to us, this would provide us the needed flexibility within a reasonable amount of time to work with individual-skill development with our students.

Richard A. Kaiser (Western State College of Colorado): I would like a question to be answered. Does this refer to any team member—meaning large squads can participate—or only one can participate at a time in the eight hours?

Mr. Lindemann: It is my understanding that full squads can participate.

Terry Wanless (University of North Dakota): We can start basketball practice September 1?

Mr. Lindemann: That would be correct.

Robert E. Hartwell (Adelphi University): I oppose this legislation. I have great concern about the number of part-time coaches I employ and what it means in my contractual obligations to those part-time coaches with these eight hours per week.

Robert V. Brennan (Wayne State University, Michigan): I oppose this for the same reasons. Part-time coaches and many of us share facilities with health, physical education and recreation classes. I think it will be a facilities problem as well as a coaching problem for many of us.

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): I would urge support for No. 96. If you stop and think about what's going on on our campuses in terms of opening facilities for students to come in and practice on their own, what the Council has tried to do is to provide us the kind of structure and framework necessary to provide better control and better management of those facilities and those times.

I don't believe we need to hire additional staff in order to do it. But I think it will improve significantly the utilization of the time of the student-athlete. It's not going to interfere with the academic side, and it's limited to eight hours a week, thereby providing ample time to pursue outside of the season their academic pursuits.

Mr. Hartwell: I don't think it's a matter of the use of their facilities. The kids have every right to participate in intramural recreation whether it be supervised by the recreation staff, intramural staff or others. It doesn't have to be the coaching staff. Many of them are getting together to practice on their own. This is what they do since they started to take part in athletics as youths. It doesn't seem to be a problem that they play and participate.

Joseph B. Oxendine (Pembroke State University): I oppose this because I really think this is a serious blow to the reform movement. I think it is the most serious thing we have dealt with. To argue that there are safety problems implies that we ought to have the coaching staff in there not eight hours a week but perhaps 48 hours a week. There are still going to be times of unauthorized or unsupervised practice. So we are not going to cover this safety problem with this proposal.

Robert E. Burke (Northeast-10 Conference): If this legislation passes, it essentially eliminates the playing- and practice-season regulation. It also means that for about nine months of the year we are going to be conducting practice sessions in mostly all of our sports. I urge defeat of this proposal.

James J. Sims (University of California, Riverside): We are opposed to this proposal on the same basis that we have been hearing here. People are going to be playing basketball in the gymnasium on their own outside of that eight hours that you are allowing. You are simply allowing eight more hours of supervised practice. You take away the November 5 to October 15 basketball practice and allow it to go on way ahead of time. We are opposed to this.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): I sometimes get confused, as many of us do, as to what the reform movement means. In the past year or two, we were hearing about the national student survey. Student-athletes' time was being demanded too much for intercollegiate athletics. We went to traditional and nontraditional seasons and limited it to 22 and 24 weeks. We went to hour limitations. It's scary to think that the Division II Steering Committee or the Council would allow basketball practice to start September 1. It's almost unbelievable.

Nine months of contact between coaches and athletes with a minimum of four hours of practice every week for nine straight months. I really urge you to knock this down very quickly before it gets out of control.

Kathy Argo (San Francisco State University): I would just remind everyone that the vast majority of the sports that we offer have a larger component to their success in the area of skill development as opposed to strength and conditioning.

Currently, we are not able to work with our athletes in the skill-development area. If we use the eight-hour week, we are only permitted to condition. This gives us the flexibility to work on a component that's important in many of our sports to a greater extent than conditioning or strength development.

[Proposal No. 96 (page A-132) was defeated by Division II.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Basketball Practice

Robert N. Evers (New Mexico Highlands University): I move Proposal No. 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

I thought the Council was prepared to support this proposal, but I

would urge definite consideration of this considering that Division II starts basketball the Friday before Thanksgiving and we only have two weeks or less to prepare for the first game with organized practices before the present November 1 starting date.

Clint Bryant (Augusta College): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee and Council, I speak in support of this proposal. The steering committee agrees with the proposal that moving the starting date for basketball practice to November 1 without moving the starting date for competition unnecessarily compresses the preparation time for student-athletes. Therefore, we would ask that you support this proposal.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): I am speaking as a former college basketball coach and for several colleagues who coached with or against me. Years and years ago when we had a 26-game limit in Division I, we could not start before December 1. That was fine. We could play 26 games without any problem whatsoever. October 15 is not the problem. I think the problem is that we start the weekend before Thanksgiving.

This year, our women's team went two weeks without a basketball game. They were playing November 19. Our men went 12 days without a basketball game. There obviously is no problem getting 26 games completed in the amount of time that we allow Division II basketball competition. I really think the problem is the starting date. That same weekend, we have volleyball, soccer and football going on and basketball that Friday night. The starting date is the problem. Other than that, we have had no problem with that November 1 date.

I know it's a lot less time, but I am telling you that when you have five or six weeks as a basketball coach, by the fifth or sixth week you are desperately trying to keep the attention of your athletes and begging for outside scrimmages. In four weeks, a team can get ready to play. But other than that, we didn't have any facility conflicts with two basketball teams and a volleyball team. Our basketball coaches were not unhappy with the fact that they started November 1. Quarter-system schools that begin classes in late September liked the idea of having maybe more than three weeks for incoming freshmen and college transfers. Economic demands are considerably different than what we are used to, but October 15 gets them into that daily practice immediately. But I do seriously think the problem with Division II is playing the weekend before Thanksgiving. That's really not necessary now that we have restricted ourselves to 26 games.

I would urge that you stay with the November 1 date and look for an opportunity next year to move our starting date to Thanksgiving weekend and maybe even December 1. That's appropriate time for athletes to be involved in basketball.

Paul Ruddy (Lewis University): I speak in support of Proposal 47. This legislation is sensitive to the facility limitations and a more

reasonable teaching environment that many Division II institutions operate under.

With the November 1 starting date, a facility could be tied up with eight hours of practice each day. This causes problems for an institution that uses the same facility for teaching classes, campus recreation and athletics. Because of facility constraints, moving the starting date back will permit an institution to dedicate a more reasonable number of hours to basketball practice that is conducive to meeting the other facility demands.

Basketball coaches also have felt a lack of time to work with players on individual skills. The November 1 starting date causes the coach to concentrate heavily on team concepts only since he or she has only 19 days before the first contest. This proposal has the support of the Presidents Commission, the Women's Basketball Coaches Association and the National Association of Basketball Coaches.

Betty F. Jaynes (Women's Basketball Coaches Association): On behalf of all Division II coaches of women's basketball, we urge your support of this proposal. Moving the starting date for on-court basketball practice to November 1 without a corresponding adjustment in the starting date for competition is counterproductive to the needs of the student-athlete.

By compressing the on-court practice session, the academic welfare, health and safety of student-athletes is placed in jeopardy. I ask for your support of this.

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): This item also was discussed at the CEO forum yesterday. After the discussion, the issue was taken up by the Executive Committee and the Presidents Commission voted to support Proposal 47.

Edward P. Markey (St. Michael's College): I don't know how many people are aware of the coaches summit that took place. The basketball coaches summit recently indicated the intensity of the coaches in trying to provide direction and the importance to them of the added two weeks.

In speaking with George Blaney, president of the National Association of Basketball Coaches Association just yesterday, 100 arguments can be made pro and con for retaining the November 1 starting date. But the point of concern for those coaches was the time it takes in developing, particularly the new people coming into a program. We have a responsibility in my estimation to support these people. The money coming through Division I basketball has helped all of us. I think this is one opportunity not only to provide them with the opportunity to expand, develop, direct and teach these people, but to give them some support. That was the theme of the coaches. I urge your support of their request.

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): In keeping with the reform movement, which I think we are trying to do although we do get mixed signals, it's interesting that one of the highlights of the Presidents Commission was the time demanded on basketball as a

result of moving the playing and practice season.

I fail to see how increasing the playing and practice season will relieve facility scheduling. Therefore, I would urge defeat of Proposal 47 and support of No. 49.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): What happened to the emphasis on time-demand reform? What I hear are arguments about the fact that the quality of intercollegiate basketball will diminish or that the basketball coaches need the time to do a really good job. Well, why not start August 15 or September 1? We said three or four years ago, less time in the athletics facility more time in the library.

Richard R. Meckfessel (University of Missouri, St. Louis): We voted against the previous proposal because we felt it was unreasonable. This proposal is not unreasonable. I can assure you that basketball players throughout the country have not been held up in the library between October 15 and November 1 from three to five o'clock in the afternoon these last two years. Instead, they have been in the gymnasium playing unsupervised pick-up games, developing bad habits and creating enemies.

I think this October 15 starting date has stood the sport of basketball and intercollegiate athletics very well for many, many years. I don't think it has done a bit of good for the student-athlete in terms of his academic performance and his academic commitment. I would urge as a basketball coach and as an athletics director that this proposal be supported.

[Proposal No. 47 (page A-83) was adopted by Division II, 158-54.]

[The meeting was recessed for 20 minutes.]

RECONSIDERATION OF VOTING ACTION

Reconsideration of Recruiting Materials

G. Jean Cerra (Barry University): I would like to move reconsideration of Proposal No. 40.

Mr. Lindemann (Humboldt State University): Did you vote on the prevailing side?

Ms. Cerra: Yes, I did.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ms. Cerra: The purpose of reconsidering Proposal No. 40 is so that we can consider Proposal No. 40-2, which is an amendment that allows recruiting brochures or media guides—one or the other—to be included as recruiting materials.

It is my opinion that it is a lot cheaper to send a recruiting brochure or a media guide to a prospect than it is to pay for an expense-paid visit to the campus for them or to send a coach into the home in order to recruit them and tell them about our institution.

In this case, I think a picture is worth \$1,000 or more instead of a thousand words. So I move that we reconsider and urge your support in reconsidering Proposal No. 40.

Marilyn McNeil (California Polytechnic State University): I beg your indulgence in reconsidering Proposal 40 as well. We consider this as basically a gender-equity issue. For some of the less physical men's sports, the opportunity to learn about your programs without any natural media visibility is really a detriment. This is something that should be in the hands of the student-athlete so they can make an informed decision. We believe that institutions must take that responsibility.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 40 was passed, 140-73.]

Ms. Cerra: I move Proposal No. 40-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

I already gave the rationale for considering Proposal 40-2, so I don't think it's necessary to say anything else.

Ms. McNeil: I would like to explain my point about the gender-equity issue. We believe that natural media happens for the more visible sports. Newspapers and television pick it up. Therefore, those sports are not being limited in the information that they can get to the student-athlete.

We do believe that the women and some of the less physical men's sports need information from the institution. NACWAA does not necessarily support No. 40, it supports No. 40-2. They do want some information out there, but perhaps not all the information that No. 40 would allow.

[Proposal No. 40-2 (page A-74) was adopted by Division II, 170-46.]

Mr. Lindemann: We are now prepared to reconsider No. 40 as amended.

Lawrence E. Fitzgerald (Southern Connecticut State University): I have a parliamentary inquiry about No. 40-1. It is listed as a Division I only roll call vote. But it seems to have some implications for Division II.

As I read No. 40-1, if it passes in Division I, we will be able to provide game programs as part of our recruiting. Yet that's not coming to this body for a vote?

Mr. Lindemann: There was not a Division II sponsor of this particular item. That's why it is not before this body.

Mr. Fitzgerald: But is that correct, if Division I passes this?

Mr. Lindemann: They will be able to provide those items, yes.

Mr. Fitzgerald: But will we be able to?

Mr. Lindemann: No.

Mr. Fitzgerald: Why not? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative.

Mr. Lindemann: This is a divided proposal. This body would not address that specific issue. It was not proposed in Division II.

Mr. Fitzgerald: Thank you.

[Proposal No. 40 (page A-70) was adopted by Division II, upon reconsideration, as amended by No. 40-2, 201-10, one abstention.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Noninstitutional Publications

Janet R. Kittell (California State University, Chico): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 58.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is intended to permit an athletics department staff member to write educational articles related to NCAA rules and crowd control for noninstitutional publications dedicated to reporting on an institution's athletics activities, provided the staff member does not receive compensation for writing such articles.

The current legislation prohibiting athletics staff members from writing any articles for these noninstitutional publications was adopted at the 1993 Convention in response to concerns expressed regarding compensation being provided for the endorsement of these publications or writing articles about the institution's athletics programs for such publications.

Such a practice was contrary to the principle set forth in Bylaw 11.3.2.7 precluding athletics department staff members from receiving compensation for promoting outside commercial entities that produce items that contain the names and pictures of student-athletes.

It is important, however, that athletics department staff members be able to write articles for such publications related to NCAA regulations in order to educate individuals about the application of NCAA legislation to situations in which they may become involved. It is probably accurate to say that a large group of subscribers to these noninstitutional publications are athletics representatives, boosters or fans of that specific institution's athletics program. Thus, such publications can serve as a beneficial forum to educate boosters and fans of that institution regarding applicable NCAA rules and crowd-control concerns.

Further, the principle in Bylaw 11.3.2.7 will not be compromised inasmuch as staff members will not receive compensation for writing such articles.

I urge you to support Proposal No. 58.

[Proposal No. 58 (page A-95) was adopted by Division II.]

Scouting of Opponents

Ollie M. Bowman (Hampton University): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 59.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to preclude the scouting of opponents in Division II, except for contests that are a part of a tournament in which the institution is participating. The prohibition of off-campus, in-person scouting of opponents is not prohibited. But this does reduce the cost of athletics programs. And it will permit the exchange of films and paying for films and videotapes for scouting purposes. I urge your support of this proposal.

John E. Wagnon (University of Central Oklahoma): A question came up in the Lone Star Conference meeting yesterday as to whether

or not a telephone call to another coach was considered scouting?

Mr. Lindemann: I don't believe so. Not under the provisions that are identified here. This is in-person.

Doug Echols (South Atlantic Conference): Proposal No. 59 is another example of unnecessary national legislation. Scouting opportunity should be dictated by individual institutional budgets or by conference regulations. Although for some conference schools or regional competition there could be a great distance to travel for scouting, many Division II schools are in close proximity to each other and selective scouting is not expensive.

Some conferences and independent institutions in Division II already have scouting restrictions and this is where the control feature should exist.

Additionally, on-site scouting has always been a part of the developmental process for young coaches. We will be exchanging the on-site scouting opportunity for the nightmare of administering local transfers and the associated expenses. To have national restrictive legislation will complicate an already difficult overall NCAA monitoring program. I would ask you who will be considered a scout? Who is not a scout? What will the penalties be for scouting?

The stated rationale for this proposal is that Division II institutions can reduce expenditures in their athletics programs by prohibiting the off-campus, in-person scouting of opponents. If you feel this is possible for your institution, then impose those restrictions at your school or get your conference to restrict it. We don't need to put a national mandate on scouting for every Division II school in the country. The members of the South Atlantic Conference encourage you to vote "no" on Proposal 59.

[Proposal No. 59 (page A-96) was defeated by Division II.]

Drug-Testing Consent Form and Squad List—Nonrecruited Student-Athlete

Janet R. Kittell (California State University, Chico): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, I move the adoption of Proposal 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment reduces in part the burden of administering the drug-testing consent form.

The competitive safeguards committee supports the amendment, which in no way compromises the administration of the year-round drug-testing program inasmuch as sports included in NCAA year-round drug testing are exempted from this legislative amendment. The competitive safeguards committee has recommended that if Proposal 62 is successful, the Council exercises authority to modify the wording to indicate that any sport included in the NCAA's year-round drug-testing program be exempted from the legislation.

This modification would be consistent with the sponsor's intent and would obviate the need to modify this legislation if and when sports other than Division I football and track are added to the

NCAA year-round drug-testing proposal.

I urge you to support Proposal No. 62.

[Proposal No. 62 (page A-98) was adopted by Division II.]

Season of Competition

Harold J. McGee (Jacksonville State University): On behalf of the Council and the Two-Year College Relations Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 63.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council and the Two-Year College Relations Committee, I urge you to vote in favor of Proposal 63. As the rationale statement indicates, exempting preseason scrimmages from counting as a season of competition for two-year college student-athletes will help reduce the vulnerability of NCAA member institutions in allowing a student-athlete to compete who may not be eligible.

Additionally, the committee believes that the proposal is in the best interest of the student-athlete and protects the student-athlete should he or she receive inaccurate information from an unreliable source.

On behalf of the Council, I urge your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 63 (page A-99) was adopted by Division II.]

Playing and Practice Seasons— Divisions I and II Baseball

Unidentifiable Delegate: I would like to move Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

Unidentifiable Delegate: Those of us who are located in the East and Northeast, because of the inclement weather, do not have enough time in the short semester to play baseball. So I'd like to see the season increased from 22 to 24 weeks.

Joseph H. Hagan (Assumption College): I would like to speak against this. On behalf of the Commission, I urge you to defeat this proposal just as you did in last year's Convention. The sponsors contend that because baseball is subject to weather conditions, two weeks should be added to the season.

I, on behalf of the Commission, contend that to do so is directly contrary to the recent reform movement related to time demands on student-athletes. I urge you all to defeat this proposal.

[Proposal No. 50 (page A-87) was defeated by Division II, 50-149, nine abstentions.]

Full-Time Enrollment—Correspondence Courses

Milton L. Bradley (Delta State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 67 on behalf of the NCAA Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

As a member of the Academic Requirements Committee, I urge your support of this proposal. It is intended to strengthen the Association's academic standards by precluding the use of correspondence courses for purposes of establishing full-time enrollment. Correspondence courses are subject to abuse by individuals who seek to find loopholes in order to maintain eligibility.

Bear in mind that this proposal will still allow individuals to utilize correspondence courses to satisfy other degree requirements. However, it will require that those students who choose to take correspondence courses establish their minimum full-time program by using hours other than correspondence hours.

[Proposal No. 67 (page A-104) was adopted by Division II.]

Regular Academic Year—Correspondence Courses

Mr. Bradley: I move the adoption of Proposal No. 68 on behalf of the Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

As a member of the Academic Requirements Committee, I urge your support of this proposal.

As you are aware, the proposal simply confirms the official interpretation that correspondence courses taken during the 1993-94 academic year and thereafter shall not count as regular academic year courses to fulfill the new 75/25 satisfactory-progress rule.

The Academic Requirements Committee has received concerns from various institutional and conference administrators regarding the use of correspondence courses to circumvent the legislative intent of that rule. It should be noted that this proposal will not effect correspondence courses taken before 1993-94.

[Proposal No. 68 (page A-105) was adopted by Division II.]

Eligibility—Five-Year/10-Semester Rule

Janet R. Kittell (California State University, Chico): On behalf of the Council and the Eligibility Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 71.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this legislation is to allow the Eligibility Committee more flexibility in its authority to grant extensions of eligibility to student-athletes.

Before the creation of the Administrative Review Panel, extensions were granted only when student-athletes were unable to attend collegiate institutions for documented reasons. Since last year's Convention, the Administrative Review Panel has considered several appeals for what appeared to be compelling, documented situations that warranted such action, even though the reasons did not meet the current criteria.

As a result, the panel recommended, and the Eligibility Committee and the Council agreed, that the Eligibility Committee should consider all appeals related to the five-year/10-semester rule and that the provisions of Bylaw 30.6.1 should be modified to provide the Eligibility Committee this broader authority.

On behalf of the Council and the Eligibility Committee, I encourage you to adopt this proposal. This legislation is permissive and will directly benefit our student-athletes.

[Proposal No. 71 (page A-107) was adopted by Division II.]

Academic Degree Requirements—Two-Year College Transfers

Mary Lisko (Augusta College): On behalf of the Council and Aca-

demetic Requirements Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 72.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal specifies that at least 25 percent of the credit hours used to fulfill the academic requirements of a two-year college transfer student must be earned at the two-year college that awards the degree. It will establish an academic requirement that is comparable to the one academic year in residence that four-year colleges traditionally require in order to confer a degree.

Transfer students should not be permitted to fulfill the Association's transfer requirements merely by attending a degree mill that will award associate degrees to students who have completed little or no academic work at that institution.

The Academic Requirements Committee and the Two-Year College Relations Committee both strongly support this legislation. I urge you to adopt it.

[Proposal No. 72 (page A-108) was adopted by Division II.]

George W. Schubert (University of North Dakota): Can I ask for a point of order on Proposal No. 68? It says there we are talking about that being effective during the 1993-94 academic year and thereafter. Yet the effective date says immediate. Could you explain how that relates? I'm sorry I didn't notice this until after the vote, but you will note there it says 1993-94 academic year and thereafter, but it says the effective date is immediate.

Mr. Lindemann: If you look at the rationale, this proposal confirms an official interpretation that was adopted previously. That's why it is effective immediately. It's already been in effect. I guess this is codifying an interpretation.

We are now on Proposal No. 73.

Eligibility—Two-Year College Transfer

Jerry C. Vandergriff (Angelo State University): On behalf of the Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move proposal No. 73.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council and as a member of the Recruiting Committee, I urge your support of this proposal.

As you are aware, under current legislation, a student-athlete who transfers from a four-year institution during the academic year could represent both four-year institutions against outside competition during the same academic year, provided the student-athlete meets an exception to the transfer residence requirement. It is the belief of the Recruiting Committee and the Council that it is only equitable to allow a two-year college transfer the same opportunity if the student has only participated in regularly scheduled scrimmages at two-year colleges.

Your support of this proposal will provide for consistent treatment of these transfer students.

Terry Wanless (University of North Dakota): I have a question about Proposal 75. If that passes, where would we eliminate the opportunity for a "4-1-4" student-athlete eligible for a mid-year trans-

fer? Would we be allowing a two-year transfer to be immediately eligible? Wouldn't we have an inconsistent rule?

Mr. Lindemann: Proposal 75 relates only to the use of the one-time transfer exception. It's basketball specific.

Mr. Wanless: I understand that. Would this legislation allow a basketball player to play two scrimmages, transfer at midyear and be immediately eligible?

Mr. Lindemann: That appears to be correct.

Mr. Wanless: He or she could compete for two institutions within the same academic year?

Mr. Lindemann: That appears to be correct.

Mr. Wanless: If No. 75 is passed, we would be eliminating that opportunity for a student-athlete who was transferring from a four-year institution?

Mr. Lindemann: That is what I am told, correct.

Harold J. McGee (Jacksonville State University): The Two-Year College Relations Committee gets a lot of this stuff. We have problems with scrimmages, auditions or rehearsals that are unique and don't apply to the four-year model. We have two-year systems in which a student may be involved in a scrimmage, audition or trial situation, withdraw from that college before the starting date and in no way appear in the system or your records. Then there may be a press release saying he or she played in the scrimmage. If that student comes to you, you become very vulnerable. So in part, the legislation keeps us from being entrapped in this transfer process.

Richard A. Kaiser (Western State College of Colorado): In No. 63, which we have already passed, we made it possible for a junior college or community college athlete to participate in scrimmages and still be eligible. Is that correct?

Mr. Lindemann: Without losing a season of competition, that is correct.

Mr. Kaiser: So No. 73 is basically the same thing or not?

Mr. McGee: It applies to different rules and codes within. We're just trying to correct different places.

Mr. Kaiser: Somebody needs to explain it to me then.

Mr. McGee: As you are aware, it's a big thick book. There are several different segments of rules and regulations we are trying to get together. I tried to touch on the main points. It is not the same application. One deals with seasons of eligibility and one pertains to transfer requirements from season to season. It's just a different regulation with the same problem that we're trying to correct.

Mr. Lindemann: Thank you, Harold. Is there further discussion? I guess we will do this by paddle vote. If we don't know what we are talking about, we may as well vote with a paddle. I just want to give a little advice to my faculty rep, you are on your own on this one. I don't have any idea what we are talking about.

[Proposal No. 73 (page A-109) was adopted by Division II.]

One-Time Transfer Exception—Division II

David O'Toole (Bellarmine College): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 75.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal precludes a Division II student-athlete who is using the one-time transfer exception from competing at two four-year institutions during the same academic year in the sport of basketball.

Currently, Bylaw 14.6.4.4.7 prohibits two-year college transfers from competing at the four-year school to which they transfer if they participated during the fall semester. However, that legislation does not preclude a four-year college transfer student from participating at a Division II institution during the same academic year.

Many of these transfers involve fourth- and fifth-year Division I student-athletes transferring to Division II institutions, which may have adverse academic consequences for the student-athlete, such as the loss of academic credit hours upon transfer.

These transfer students also can have a major impact on conference and national competition. The addition of midyear transfers also may necessitate "rescouting" opponents during the second term. It is in the best interest of the student-athlete, the affected institutions and Division II championship competition to allow the one-time transfer exception for four-year college transfers in the sport of basketball to be effective only with the beginning of the next basketball season. I urge you to support Proposal 75.

[Proposal No. 75 (page A-111) was adopted by Division II.]

Summer Basketball Leagues—Transfer Student

Richard A. Johannigmeier (Washburn University of Topeka): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to specify that a student-athlete who is transferring from a four-year institution and has been officially accepted for enrollment at a second institution and receives permission from that institution to participate in an NCAA-sanctioned summer basketball league does not count on the summer-league roster as a representative of either institution.

Under current legislation, incoming senior prospects and two-year college transfers do not count in the summer basketball limitations established for the institution that they will attend in the ensuing academic year. The Interpretations Committee recommended this proposal to the Council because it believes that a prospective student-athlete transferring from one four-year institution to another should be treated similarly to other prospects.

Thus, he or she should not be included in the summer basketball league limitations for the institution to which he or she will be transferring for the next academic year, provided standard administrative conditions are fulfilled.

I urge you to support Proposal No. 77.

[Proposal No. 77 (page A-113) was adopted by Division II.]

Financial Aid—

Employment Earnings and Athletics Participation Compensation

Marilyn McNeil (California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo): On behalf of the Council and Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 81.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the 1993 Convention, the membership adopted legislation to exempt employment earnings from being included in a student-athletes individual financial aid limits if those employment earnings were obtained after a student-athlete had exhausted his or her eligibility in a particular sport during the prior term.

The Council and financial aid committee believes that it would be more equitable for all student-athletes to be permitted to exempt employment earnings any time after exhausting eligibility rather than being required to wait until the beginning of the next regular term.

This proposal also would permit a student-athlete to exempt any compensation received for athletics participation that occurs after eligibility has been exhausted, such as "barnstorming" tours.

Finally, this proposal retains the safeguard that a student-athlete using this exemption may not practice or compete in intercollegiate athletics. It also will treat the employment earnings of fall sport and spring sport participants more equitably.

I urge you to adopt this legislation.

[Parts A and C of Proposal No. 81 (page A-116) were adopted by Division II.]

Financial Aid—Pell Grant

Robert N. Evers (New Mexico Highlands University): On behalf of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference, we move adoption of Proposal 84.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference believes this is a student welfare issue. With our present financial aid limitation, if we take a grant-in-aid value and a \$900 Pell Grant index and add them together, we get a figure of how much aid a student is allowed to have. If we then compare that to a general student on campus who has a zero Pell index with an athlete who has a zero Pell index, the combination of athletics and allowable aid for the athlete may be several hundred dollars less than for the general student.

As an example, our campus has a \$4,200 grant-in-aid limit. Take the \$900 Pell allowance, and it gives that student-athlete a \$3,100 individual limit. A student on our campus who is not an athlete and has a zero Pell index would receive a \$2,500 Pell Grant, a \$1,000 award and a \$2,040 work-study job for \$5,200 and some odd dollars. They are receiving several hundreds more than the student-athlete.

Two years ago, I had an athlete who received an athletics award and a financial aid award within several days of each other. Since the financial aid award was more than the athletics award, they accepted the financial aid award and turned down the athletics schol-

arship. Then I had the ticklish situation of explaining to them later since you came under the definition of a recruited student-athlete, your financial aid award still had to be reduced. That was not a fun thing to explain to either the student-athlete or their parents. We feel this is an equity issue of student welfare at the Division II level.

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): Some people have asked us how we arrived at \$1,500 as the appropriate amount. That was the result of a survey taken by the NCAA. There was a variety of responses to that. We took the average of what you were accepting. You may remember filling out the form. One of the possible responses was the full amount the Federal government would allow all the way down to the current level. We took those allocations, averaged them and came up with the \$1,500 total. That's how we arrived at those figures.

That also helps keep the vast majority of Division II institutions—I am not saying there wouldn't be a high private cost that wouldn't fall in the category—from what happened at New Mexico Highlands.

[Proposal No. 84 (page A-119) was adopted by Division II.]

Required Day Off During Playing Season

Richard A. Johannimgmeier (Washburn University of Topeka): On behalf of the Council, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 93.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal eliminates some concerns expressed by the men's basketball committee to the Interpretations Committee that under current legislation institutions are required to provide student-athletes with one day off per week even while the team is participating in NCAA championship competition.

The intent of this proposal is to eliminate the day off requirement because it will accommodate realistic travel and practice requirements necessitated by NCAA participation.

I urge you to support Proposal No. 93.

[Part A of Proposal No. 93 (page A-129) was adopted by Division II.]

Contest Exemptions—Division II Football

Howard Elwell (Gannon University): I move the adoption of Proposal 114.

[The motion was seconded.]

The institutions listed on the sponsor line are all members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference and formerly sponsored football in Division III.

As you all know, as of this past season, our football programs were reclassified into Division II because of the elimination of the multidivisional classification. Along with these nine institutions, there are approximately 20 other Division I institutions in the ECAC whose football programs were formerly classified in Division III. They were forced into Division I-AA because of the demise of multidivisional classification. With the elimination of multidivisional classification,

all of us got together to form the ECAC football league and adopted most of the cost-containment ideas that were proposed several years ago for the ill-fated Division I-AAA. For example, we have no athletics aid, only need-based aid, as we formerly had in Division III. We have limitations on coaching staffs that permit only two full-time coaches. There is no spring practice. We have only a 10-game schedule instead of the 11 games that Division II currently is permitted to play. We have no letters of intent and we have other recruiting and cost-containment restrictions.

Our programs are faced with the reality that our level of competition essentially rules us out of consideration for the NCAA Division II competition. In our situation, Gannon University is a very small Catholic institution. We started football to enhance our male enrollment. I can assure you that our team is predominantly small Catholics. What we are proposing is a one-game playoff between two teams in our ECAC structure that would be selected after the teams are selected for the NCAA championship. In essence, this would be our bowl game.

You may not be aware of this, but Division III has had this exception for four or five years. Last year, Division I-AA adopted this same proposal and indeed did have a I-AA nonscholarship cost-containment football playoff between Iona and Wagner. We would like to do the same thing. We would like the same opportunity that's in place for Division I-AA and Division III and respectfully ask you to support this proposal.

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): A question of the presenter. Division II allows 11 games. We can all do this or not as we choose to. Why do we need to vote on legislation asking for an additional noncountable game when that league chooses to play 10 games?

Mr. Elwell: I was afraid someone was going to ask that question. It had to be Bruce. You are correct, Bruce. This is the same question that I asked the ECAC membership when we proposed this for Division I-AA last year. We do have a structure in the ECAC with four Division III games involving eight different teams. That's their season-ending championship opportunity. Because of some conference restrictions or by choice, institutions do not go to the NCAA tournament in Division III.

They did the same thing in Division I-AA last year because of the reclassification. This gives people a realistic "bowl" opportunity.

Bruce, I know I am not answering your question. But some institutions have also expressed a desire possibly to have a scrimmage before playing their 10th game. It's "enabling" legislation. We could play the bowl game as our 11th game as we choose to. I'm sorry I don't have a better answer. Just trust me, if you will. There is no hidden agenda in this proposal. Just vote for it, please.

Mr. Lindemann: Bud, you were doing real well until you made that last statement. Is there any further discussion? I think some-

body ought to ask one more question, I'd like to see him get up there and do that soft shoe again.

[Proposal No. 114 (page A-153) was adopted by Division II, 72-58, four abstentions.]

Spring Football Practice—Division II

Lynn Dorn (North Dakota State University): I move Proposal 115.

[The motion was seconded.]

We would like to have an opportunity to extend the window of opportunity in which we can have our 15 practices occur within the spring.

The question that I have for you is: Why does the steering committee feel that this is contrary to reform? We do not see it as an increase in the number of contacts or competitions or practices that they will be afforded during that time.

Mr. Lindemann: We have an individual who will respond. Complete your remarks.

Ms. Dorn: We endorse the proposal and seek your support.

Richard A. Johanningsmeier (Washburn University of Topeka): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 115. The objective of recent reform legislation is to reduce the amount of time student-athletes are required to spend on athletically related activities, particularly outside the traditional playing seasons.

Proposal 115, by increasing the number of consecutive calendar days in which spring practice sessions may occur, is contrary to the objective of the reform movement. I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 115.

Noel W. Olson (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Obviously, I disagree with Rich on that statement. I think it is in the spirit of reform because it gives a period of time off during this open window in which the student does not have to participate in football activity. Actually, I think that's better than squashing it together and then giving them time off. I think it's totally wrong to say it's not within the spirit of reform.

Gene A. Carpenter (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): I don't think we addressed the negative side. I don't think we addressed the topic.

I too had the question for the steering committee of: "Why are we against it?" That hasn't been addressed.

I'm in favor of the proposal for the same reasons Noel has. There is no question you have 21 days with 15 days to practice. We are not asking for more practice days. Three of the days are Sundays. You can't count Sundays for practice.

So basically, the legislation lets you have 18 days for 15 days of practice. I think you have a safety factor there with coaches trying to get those days in if it rains—the sliding, the muscle pulls, the whole bit—or to get the kid back on the field quicker. Divisions I-A and I-

AA both have 29 days. We talk about equity. Are our athletes different? By having the stretched-out time limit, it gives students an opportunity to relax or study. Think of your own sons practicing three weeks in a row, five days a week. Where does that give them time to study or get to that library. The legislation doesn't have good reasons. I really urge our colleagues to support this proposal.

Douglas T. Porter (Fort Valley State College): The Division II Football Committee has supported this because of the safety factor and all the other things Noel talked about. The committee feels that if we get the 29 days, it would allow recovery time for injury and not compress the time that you are forced to practice. We all talk about five days a week. We don't really do that during the regular season. We ask for those same things in the spring. We think it is in support of and in the best interests of football.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): The football player is going to belong to the coaching football staff for 29 days if this is passed. His commitment will be to football for 29 days. Just because Division I is doing it is no reason that we should do it. It's all right for us to be more enlightened than Division I. It won't hurt. I think this is clearly contrary to the academic reform movement. But I certainly am glad to hear, Gene, that your football players will, when spring practice is over, get to the library on occasion.

Howard Elwell (Gannon University): I ask members of the ECAC—we do not have spring football—to let the people who do have spring football decide this issue for themselves. Let the people who have spring football decide whether they want 21 or 29 days.

[Proposal No. 115 (page A-154) was adopted by Division II, 71-58, six abstentions.]

WAIVERS

Mr. Lindemann: At this point, we will suspend legislation and move to waiver requests.

[Note: The Division II business session heard petitions for waivers of Division II membership from Alderson-Broadus College, Lees-McCrae College, Lynn University, Tarleton State University, the University of West Florida and Western New Mexico University. The petitions were approved.]

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

[Note: The slate for Division II representatives to the Council was approved as presented.]

[The meeting was recessed.]

Tuesday Morning, January 11, 1994

The meeting was called to order at 9 a.m. with Mr. Lindemann presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Lindemann: We are ready to begin. Welcome everyone.

Before we begin today's business, the Division II Steering Committee and I would like to acknowledge two of our members whose service ends with this Convention—Ollie Bowman and Dorothy Dreyer. We also want to acknowledge Cappy Powell who is leaving the NCAA staff in order to spend a little more time with her two sons. On behalf of the steering committee and myself, I'd like to extend the following gifts as tokens of our appreciation.

This session is scheduled to adjourn at noon. It is my hope that if we conduct our business in an expedient manner that we will end the Division II business session and we will not have to reconvene at 1:30. That will be our goal for today.

Before we begin our legislative actions, you may have noticed in your listing of actions taken yesterday that there was one rather noteworthy error. Proposal 14-H, which I identified as having been adopted, is not true. It was defeated. You can take credit for that. I know that your Division I colleagues all hate you, but that's indeed what happened. We have been working with staff to identify what that means. We think we are going to be able to interpret this in a manner consistent with what we believe is the mover's intent. We will have a three-year provisional membership after which the provisional member, upon becoming a full member, will be eligible for championships and monetary distribution. We think that will be consistent with what the movers intended. Are we ready to go?

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Playing and Practice Seasons—Golf

Rita M. Castagna (Assumption College): I'd like to move Proposal No. 117.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council, I move this proposal on the basis that it will simply make the starting date in golf the same as the starting date for cross country, field hockey, soccer and water polo.

[Proposal No. 117 (page A-157) was adopted by Division II.]

Clearinghouse Fee—Nonrecruited Student-Athlete

Ollie Bowman (Hampton University): On behalf of the Council and Special Committee to Oversee Implementation of the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse, I move Proposal No. 128.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council and special committee believe the adoption of this legislation will not provide a recruiting advantage to an institution, but would expedite the processing of initial-eligibility certification of nonrecruited student-athletes.

This legislation is permissive, therefore, allowing an institution to pay the \$18 registration fee would also speed up the processing of nonrecruited enrolled student-athletes after the start of an academic year.

[Proposal No. 128 (page A-166) was defeated by Division II, 77-128, two abstentions.]

Transfer—Hearing Opportunity

Dorothy E. Dreyer (Wayne State University, Michigan): On behalf of the Council and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal 133.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal, which would be effective immediately, would require institutions to establish an appeal process for student-athletes when permission is denied to contact institutions about transferring or when the institution will not provide a release pursuant to the one-time transfer exception.

The Council is in support of this proposal because student-athletes are often denied releases to transfer for reasons that are not in the best interest of the student-athlete. Often times the student-athlete may be denied a release based on the recommendation of coaches who may decide to grant or deny a release for personal reasons. This proposal would provide the student-athlete with a forum that would allow a hearing to be conducted by an institutional entity or committee outside the athletics department similar to the current hearing required when a student-athlete's financial aid is not renewed. This hearing opportunity ensures that the best interests of the student-athlete as well as the institution are served.

This proposal is consistent with the trend to advance the welfare of the student-athlete. On behalf of the Council and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I encourage you to adopt this proposal.

Pamela L. Wustrow (Springfield College): Representing the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, we support Proposal 133. We feel that this proposal will be most appropriate because at the very least a student-athlete should know why they are being denied a release to transfer. If such reasons are unreasonable, that decision should be made by authorities outside of the athletics department. If they prove to be unreasonable, the student-athlete's rights should be protected. If such a decision is not unreasonable, then the best interests of the institution have been met.

Next year's Convention will be dedicated to enhancing the welfare of the student-athlete. Why wait until next year? Let's begin now by approving this proposal.

[Proposal No. 133 (page A-169) was adopted by Division II.]

Recruiting—Division II Tryouts

Rita M. Castagna (Assumption College): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 137.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal 137 is to permit a prospective student-athlete to participate in a Division II tryout against a member institution's team at any time during the academic year. The liberalization of the permissible Division II tryout legislation will create greater flexibility on campus related to the recruitment of prospects. It also

Division II Business Session _____ 143

will allow a prospect to get a better understanding of the institution's campus and the student-athletes.

Further, any potential out-of-season practice concerns are addressed inasmuch as any tryout activities involving student-athletes conducted outside the playing season must be counted as part of the eight hours of conditioning activities currently permitted outside of the institution's playing season. I urge you to support Proposal No. 137.

Terry Wanless (University of North Dakota): We had a question yesterday in our conference meetings about the potential violations that may occur if a coaching staff is involved with their team in a basketball-related activity during a tryout situation after their season is over. Can we have an answer to that question?

Mr. Lindemann: It is our understanding that if a prospect were in the gym participating in basketball activities against students who are currently on the team but were not engaged in practice drills and were not running either the team's offense or defense, but rather were actually participating in a pickup kind of activity, that that would be considered appropriate.

I guess the point here is that the coach doesn't come on the floor with a whistle and start conducting the activity. I think most of you know in these kinds of circumstances what we are talking about is a coach being able to watch the student on the floor with the players. That's the intent of the legislation.

I think most of us know also that students would appreciate having that opportunity.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): I was going to speak against this, but it seems so obviously bogus that I don't want to insult the intelligence of my colleagues because clearly you can have team practice.

You bring a recruit in every Saturday and have your basketball team practice with that recruit. For you to tell me that's all right as long as they are not running their own offense or their own defense, I mean, what's so exotic about playing man-to-man? They all are going to be playing man-to-man or zone. This is bogus. I urge you to vote against this.

Clint Bryant (Augusta College): First of all, this rule is probably better because it was probably the most abused violation in Division II basketball.

Coaches are going to be able to better evaluate the prospect. The prospect can better evaluate his chances of coming in and participating. There is no practice. They are pickup games. Tryouts are primarily pickup games where kids are playing basketball and you evaluate. Coaches feel this would help them in the recruiting process. You will be able to spend less time on the road recruiting because you will be able to evaluate a prospect with the current players that you have available.

For people who think this rule is not a good rule, they are insensitive or have had their head in the sand.

Richard A. Johanningmeier (Washburn University of Topeka): I want to remind the delegates this is not just a basketball proposal. This would be for the swimmers, for tennis players, et cetera. So it's not just a basketball issue.

J. Philip Roach (Rollins College): I am concerned about the situation we put the recruit in. We will put them in a tryout situation during their season the way I read this legislation. Is that right? We can have an athlete get injured on our campus?

Mr. Lindemann: That is not permissible under the current legislation.

Mr. Roach: Oh, I misread it. Thank you

Terry Wanless (University of North Dakota): If your high-school season extends beyond the college season, you have no chance of a tryout situation with your current players.

This legislation allows us to bring in student-athletes and tryout against current people in your program. We don't have that opportunity right now, so we really don't have a true tryout situation. You can bring them in to compete against athletes who have used up their eligibility. We are trying to accomplish a cost-effective method of reducing recruiting costs. The tryout method helps us do that. I urge your support of this legislation. It's good legislation. We don't need to be paranoid about it. We won't have coaches out there attempting to abuse the rules. They are good people. This is good legislation.

[Proposal No. 137 (page A-173) was adopted by Division II.]

Evaluations—Division II Men's Basketball

Lynn Dorn (North Dakota State University): I move Proposal No. 138.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this is to permit Division II men's basketball coaches to have an opportunity to attend high-school all-star games that occur within the state in which the member institution is located. This is going to have an impact upon the public relations of visiting with the parents and attending the event. Almost 100 percent of the time the student-athletes will have already committed by signing the national letter of intent. We don't see it as a recruiting advantage. We see it as a continued opportunity to establish a relationship with that young man.

Clint Bryant (Augusta College): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I speak in opposition to Proposal 138. Proposal 138 would permit Division II men's basketball coaches to evaluate prospects during any boys high-school all-star game that occurs within the state in which the member institution is located.

The problem I think the steering committee had was with the word "any." I don't think the legislation is necessarily bad legislation. I think it should go back to the table and maybe be stated "those high school association within that state."

A lot of times institutions sit on bordering states and recruit in two states equally or in the other state more than they do in the

state in which they reside.

I think the legislation probably needs to go back to the table and be cleaned up a bit. The steering committee would be in support with some adjustments.

[Proposal No. 138 (page A-174) was adopted by Division II.]

Recruiting—Automobile Transportation

Jerry C. Vandergriff (Angelo State University): I move Proposal No. 141.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council and as a member of the Recruiting Committee, I urge you to support 141.

We believe it is unreasonable to require an institution to count an official visit for each prospect in an automobile even if the institution is not recruiting the other individuals. For example, if a prospect's brother is a sophomore high-school student-athlete and accompanies the prospect on a visit, the institution could not reimburse the prospect for his automobile transportation because current legislation would require the institution to count the brother's visit as an official visit. This proposal would specify that the visit would count as an official visit only for the prospect being recruited.

[Proposal No. 141 (page A-177) was adopted by Division II.]

Recruiting—Gifts at Coaches' Clinic

Janet R. Kittell (California State University, Chico): On behalf of the Council, I move for the adoption of Proposal 145.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal 145 is to prohibit high-school, college preparatory and two-year college coaches from receiving prizes in conjunction with an institution's coaches' clinic, including prizes donated by outside sponsors.

Much concern has been expressed that under the current rule, many institutions are soliciting door prizes from outside sponsors in conjunction with their coaching clinics. Because some of the prizes are of considerable value, the motive behind such prizes may relate to the recruitment of a coach's prospect and could result in the institution receiving an improper recruiting advantage. The intent of the institutional coaching clinics is to provide appropriate instruction to the high-school, prep school and two-year college coaches related to the sport and not to be used as a forum for recruitment of prospects.

The prohibition against receiving any prizes in conjunction with such clinics will create a more level playing field and protect against any potential abuse regarding the purpose of such clinics. I urge you to support Proposal No. 145.

[Proposal No. 145 (page A-180) was adopted by Division II.]

Recruitment

Richard A. Johanningsmeier (Washburn University of Topeka): On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal 162.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is the first in a series of proposals that will be considered during this session that relate to the Legislative Review Committee's efforts over the past year to identify ways in which recruiting regulations can be deregulated and simplified.

Specific to this proposal, the current legislation related to those activities that constitute recruitment of a prospect and those that do not constitute recruitment often make it difficult for institutions to make the determination whether a prospect has been recruited. This proposal will specify an all-inclusive list of three very specific activities that make a prospect a recruited prospect and will eliminate the list of activities that do not constitute recruitment. We believe this greatly simplifies this area of recruiting regulations and will make it much easier for institutions to know whether a prospect has been recruited. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 162 (page A-199) was adopted by Division II.]

One-Visit-Per-Week Limit on Visits to Prospect's High School—Sports Other Than Football and Basketball

Mr. Johanningsmeier: On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 163.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would eliminate in sports other than football and basketball the one-visit-per-week limit to a prospect's educational institution. The rationale statement for this proposal, which is printed in your Official Notice, gives a good explanation of the proposal and the reason it is being proposed.

We would ask that you seriously consider simplifying this part of the recruiting legislation by adopting Proposal No. 163.

[Proposal No. 163 (page A-201) was adopted by Division II.]

One-Visit-Per-Week Limit on Visits to Prospect's High School—Football and Basketball

Mr. Johanningsmeier: On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 164.

[The motion was seconded.]

The reasons for this proposal are much the same as Proposal No. 163's. The only difference is that this proposal would eliminate the one-visit-per-week limit in the sports of football and basketball. The rationale remains the same—to simplify this area of recruiting regulations and to eliminate the need for additional interpretation. I urge your support.

Lynn Dorn (North Dakota State University): Chuck, will there be a window of opportunity to reconsider this should Division I have a different outcome this afternoon?

Mr. Lindemann: Yes. The window of opportunity is at any time during this session or during the general session that follows.

Ms. Dorn: Thank you.

Mr. Lindemann: It would happen in the general session after the consent package.

[Proposal No. 164 (page A-202) was adopted by Division II.]

Contact With Parents at Site of Competition

Mr. Johanningmeier: On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 165.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal eliminates the restrictions on contacting a prospect's parents before a competition or on the day of a competition.

While the prohibition relating to contacting a prospect on the day of competition remains necessary, it is the Legislative Review Committee's belief that it is no longer necessary to prohibit such contact with a prospect's parents. As noted in the proposal's rationale statement, parents of prospects often seek out coaches at the prospect's competition site. It can be awkward for coaches to have to say that they cannot talk to the parents and inadvertently violate the rule.

The adoption of this proposal will help institutions maintain compliance in this area. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 165 (page A-205) was adopted by Division II.]

Permissible Recruiters

Mr. Johanningmeier: On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 166.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal eliminates from the Manual the listing of certain examples of unavoidable incidental contacts between an athletics representative and a prospect. By eliminating these from the Manual, the committee is not saying that they no longer are examples of unavoidable incidental contact. The committee believes that these examples are commonly understood. The Manual no longer needs to be cluttered with the listing.

I would ask that you support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 166 (page A-206) was adopted by Division II.]

Telephone Calls

Mr. Johanningmeier: I move the adoption of Proposal No. 168 on behalf of the Council and Legislative Review Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is part of a series of recommendations from the Legislative Review Committee as a result of its analysis of Bylaw 13 to identify areas in which rules could be eliminated or simplified.

The committee concluded that the restrictions on telephone calls to prospective student-athletes were largely a response to concerns about abuses in the sports of football and basketball. In those sports, experience has shown that numerous calls that are both expensive and disruptive to the prospect are likely. In reviewing other sports, the committee concluded that such abuses are far less likely to occur and that the regulation and extensive tracking of telephone calls necessary to assure compliance may be unwarranted. Accordingly, the committee recommended and the Council agreed to sponsor legislation to leave in place the restriction prohibiting telephone calls to prospects until July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school. But the recommendation eliminates other

restrictions on the number and frequency of telephone calls to prospects in sports other than football and basketball. I urge your support of this legislation.

Masa Oreskovic (Valdosta State University/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is opposed to Proposal 168. We feel that the pressure present in recruiting prospective student-athletes in football and basketball are also present in recruiting for nonrevenue sports.

For example, prospects in ice hockey in the Northeast, volleyball in the West and baseball in other parts of the country face the same recruiting pressure. All prospective student-athletes deserve the same safeguards as those given to prospective student-athletes in football and basketball. There is tremendous pressure and strain on high-school student-athletes to make their decision. Adding to that pressure are the numerous phone calls coming from coaches.

Student-athletes who are heavily recruited in their respective sport already have some idea where they want to attend. Additional phone calls do not accomplish more than the current contact. We not only do not need the additional phone calls, we do not want them. We urge you to oppose this proposal.

Mr. Johanningmeier: I would like to address some of the concerns that Masa brought up that the Legislative Review Committee did consider. This was considered not only on the Division II, but on the Division I level as well. If anyone calls anyone today, they know that most of the time they get answering machines. We felt that unwanted calls could be discouraged by the student-athletes if they did not wish to receive them. In most cases today, there is some technology available to avoid those types of calls.

Secondly, in a number of sports, there were concerns that it cost more to recruit because people are forced to go off campus to make expensive trips for recruiting purposes.

Those were the arguments that the Legislative Review Committee heard and considered from a number of different coaching groups and constituencies throughout the last year. That's the Legislative Review Committee's position.

Richard A. Kaiser (Western State College of Colorado): When I was coaching about 18 years ago, we put all this stuff in because it was abusing student-athletes. We were bumping into them when it was legal to bump time and again. All of a sudden, we are going back to where we were 15 years ago for the convenience of administrators. That is who it is for. It's not for the students.

I don't believe we are doing this for the benefit of the students. We are doing it for the benefit of ourselves. I would really like for us to think about this and what Masa said. If you deregulate the phone situation, they are going to get bombarded. I don't care what you say about a phone-answering service. You still got to go through the "beep-beep-beep" all the time.

[Proposal No. 168 (page A-207) was defeated by Division II.]

Travel to Official Visit—Reimbursement

Mr. Johanningmeier: I move the adoption of Proposal No. 169 on behalf of the Council and Legislative Review Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is a result of the Legislative Review Committee's review of the Association's recruiting regulations in an effort to identify those rules that could be eliminated or simplified.

Please note that the Convention Program contains a correction for Proposal No. 169. Bylaw 13.6.2.2.1 is not deleted by the legislation.

In recommending this proposal, the Legislative Review Committee believed that it was appropriate to continue the prohibition against an institution's athletics representative from providing transportation to a prospect for an official visit. However, the committee concluded that other friends or family members should be permitted to provide transportation to a prospect and to be reimbursed by the institution for the actual mileage incurred at the same rate that the institution allows its own employees.

It appears that this modification in the current legislation would be reasonable and would not open the door to abuse. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 169 (page A-208) was adopted by Division II.]

Publicity

Mr. Johanningmeier: I move the adoption of Proposal No. 170 on behalf of the Council and Legislative Review Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is another result of the Legislative Review Committee's review of the Association's recruiting legislation to identify rules that could be eliminated or simplified.

The committee concluded that the extensive restrictions on recruiting publicity were largely the result of concerns about abuses in recruiting in the sports of football and basketball. The committee received observations from some coaches associations that those sports were eager for any publicity they could receive. They were not concerned about the use of publicity in manipulating the recruiting process. Accordingly, the committee recommended and the Council agreed to sponsor legislation to delete the recruiting publicity regulations in all sports other than football and basketball.

I urge your support of this legislation.

G. Jean Cerra (Barry University): I have some serious concerns about the type of legislation that is coming before this group. We are consistently trying to remove football and basketball and put them in a unique category. It is easier to administer and apply these kinds of rules across the board for all of our sports. I think that's the way we should look at it. We are trying to treat everybody the same. I think that's the way we should go. I urge defeat of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 170 (page A-209) was defeated by Division II.]

Camps and Clinics—Senior Prospect Prohibition

Mr. Johanningmeier: I move the adoption of Proposal No. 171

on behalf of the Council and the Legislative Review Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is another result of the Legislative Review Committee's analysis of recruiting regulations to identify rules that could be eliminated or simplified.

The committee believes it is no longer necessary to restrict the attendance of senior prospects at sports camps or clinics. By the time such camps are generally conducted, highly recruited prospects have made their commitments to specific member institutions. Others who want a recreational opportunity or a chance to improve their skills in the sport should have the opportunity to do so.

This proposal also eliminates the prohibition against employment for those students who are not high-school, preparatory school or two-year college athletics award winners. The provisions of Bylaw 13.13.1.5 continue in effect to provide protection against recruiting abuses.

I urge your support of this proposal.

Lynn Dorn (North Dakota State University): Could you please define what an award winner is? Does that assume that they are varsity students? Does that assume it is given at the high-school level?

Mr. Lindemann: I am told that it is defined by the high school. Your interpretation is accurate. It's not for us to determine an award winner. It is for the institution that grants the award.

[Proposal No. 171 (page A-212) was adopted by Division II.]

Camps and Clinics—Employment of High-School Coaches

Mr. Johanningmeier: I move the adoption of Proposal No. 173 on behalf of the Council and Legislative Review Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is another result of the Legislative Review Committee's attempt to identify recruiting regulations that can be eliminated or simplified.

The committee believes adoption of this legislation would simplify Bylaw 13.13.2.2.2 and that it would clarify regulations concerning the employment of a high-school, preparatory school or two-year college coach at the camp of a member institution or its athletics department employees.

It imposes the same restrictions for all divisions. In subparagraphs A and B of Bylaw 13.13.2.2.2, it sets forth two critical tests for such employment. Specifically, coaches must receive compensation at a rate that is commensurate with the going rate for camp counselors of like teaching ability and camping experience. And the coach may not be paid on the basis of the value the coach may have for the employer because of the coach's reputation or contact with prospective student-athletes.

The language being deleted did not contain any additional restrictions. I urge your support of this legislation.

[Part A of Proposal No. 173 (page A-214) was adopted by Division II.]

RECONSIDERATION OF VOTING ACTION

Reconsideration of Financial Aid—Pell Grant

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): Having voted on the prevailing side, I'd like to move to reconsider Proposal No. 84.

[The motion was seconded.]

While the case the presenter gave yesterday about this proposal is accurate, he did indicate that the student-athlete and the nonstudent-athlete both started with a base of a \$2,400 Pell. It's important for the membership to understand that anytime you have a Pell athlete and you use the \$2,400 and a zero index as the base, you then add athletics aid on top of that. Whether or not your institution can allow the student-athlete to go up to the amount of \$1,500 depends upon the index in the financial aid office.

At our institution, an index of about \$930 above the full cost of education is where a zero index student-athlete is. I think it would vary from institution to institution. While we walked away from some cost savings items yesterday, this legislation will have financial implications in the amount of \$600 per grant-in-aid. In the past, we have walked away from this and went through very quickly. If this is what Division II wants, then we ought to sustain where we were yesterday. But I think we ought to consider it today.

Robert N. Evers (New Mexico Highlands University): This measure was sponsored by the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference. Although we voted for it to continue, this is something that will vary by individual campus according to what your grant-in-aid values are and your cost of attendance.

It basically boils down to a student-welfare issue. If on your campus there is a difference between how much a student can receive who is a nonathlete and one who is an athlete, then you are not serving the welfare of that student-athlete by telling them that they are going to receive less simply because they are an athlete and they are both zero-Pell index students.

James H. Jordan (Delta State University): We are opposed to increasing the Pell grant. We are in an area where we have a lot of full Pell qualifiers. For example, our football team has 36 equivalencies and we might get 65 bodies out there to play. But 30 of those bodies qualify for the Pell. By taking that \$600 out, that's almost \$18,000. That is about 10 extra athletes we'll have to eliminate in our program. It's hard enough to play with 60. You get a few hurt, you are in trouble. So it stretches our program to be able to use that 60. Guys that have a lot of full Pell qualifiers need to consider this motion.

Thomas E. Spicer (Fort Hays State University): The last time I checked into it, Pell Grant money is excluded from your equivalency when you are figuring that particular number.

The Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference deals with 20 equivalencies max. We don't think it's a detriment to our program to compete at that level. We think the well-being of the student is the issue here,

not whether we can compete on the football field.

Nathan N. Salant (Gulf South Conference): We too are concerned about the welfare of the student-athlete. But if there are further cutbacks in the actual offerings at institutions, are we not hurting the welfare of the student-athlete because there will be fewer chances?

Let's look at the issue of cost containment for a minute. That \$18,000 that Dr. Jordan spoke about has nothing to do with equivalencies in terms of whether it is countable or not. But you will need to make up that money from your own actual scholarship dollars. That's the key issue. It is not a question of whether it is countable. It's a question of where does that money come from?

Let's look at it one step further. There are other programs besides football that have significant numbers of Pell Grant recipients. There are other institutions in this country that have large numbers of student-athletes who get that Pell. Do you have the dollars? We can talk about an ideal world, ladies and gentlemen, but we have to deal with reality. Division II is getting hit very hard on your own campuses in terms of available money. Scholarship numbers are shrinking. You are going to move in the direction of less and less in terms of available money to give out. You don't want to do this. This is a mistake.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 84 (page A-119) was defeated by Division II.]

Wilburn A. Campbell Jr. (Albany State College, Georgia): I ask for an interpretation on Proposal No. 137. This morning quite a bit of the deliberation was placed on the sport of basketball. Does this imply that in the sport of football a prospect may participate in spring practice?

Mr. Lindemann: I believe the prohibition against the use of equipment and contact activity is still in place, so the answer would be "no."

ISSUES FORUM

Mr. Lindemann: Well, ladies and gentlemen, you have done a fine job on the agenda that has been before us. We are going to begin the issues forum immediately. In that context, we have at least two purposes in the issues forum. One is significant based on what we have just done. You may note that we have had discussion over the last several years about deregulating in a federated way and by sport. Proposals were put forward at this Convention with that intent in mind in an effort to meet what we believed were your interests. So, two things can be served here. One is we can update you on initiatives that will be confronting us in the future. But perhaps more importantly, we can get direction and feedback from you on how you would have us proceed.

Our issues forum will begin with a discussion of restructuring. We have probably the best person that I can identify to help us walk through the effort—our new executive director, Cedric Dempsey. Please welcome Cedric.

Restructuring

Cedric W. Dempsey (NCAA Executive Director): Good morning. I had the opportunity yesterday to talk with Division III about restructuring. My comments to you today are not going to be anything in-depth. They are intended to give you some overall perspective and some insights that have been accumulated over the last couple of years. Chuck just mentioned sports federation. That point has led to the idea of the need to evaluate our present government structures.

Let me make a few comments regarding that topic. All of you are aware that there has been interest in the Association in the last two or three years to explore sports federation. We have a committee dealing with the concept. Tied in with that, there have been many individuals and institutions that have expressed interest and concern about a reorganization of divisional structure or some other paradigm of government structure. Some people are more concerned about institutional commonality than they are sports commonality, which is part of the valuation that needs to be explored when we are talking about restructuring. Should we look at allowing more flexibility within institutions to play at different levels on a sports basis, or shall we attempt to find a structure that provides more commonality by institutions?

This is not a Division I issue alone. It applies to all three divisions in some ways. In talking with Division III, their issues are as complex or even more complex because of the size of the division and the diversity of institutions within that division.

Division II certainly has its unique issues, opportunities and challenges to consider. The cost of running an athletics program is certainly another factor that has led to the need to reevaluate the present structure. All of us are looking at ways to continue opportunities for student-athletes through intercollegiate athletics. But we also are faced with financial conditions that are making that extremely difficult. So any restructuring proposal, if we are going to look at commonality by institution, must be tied into the whole area of financing programs and what kind of commonality exists there.

Philosophy is certainly another issue. I really sensed that yesterday in talking to the Division III group. They have had an influx of institutions into the division that probably don't have a full understanding of the philosophical mission of Division III. That's obviously created some contrasting philosophies. I sense Division II has some of that same problem in reaching a commonality of direction.

So philosophy, financial considerations and survival of programs are issues. Wanting to control your own destiny certainly is an issue. Some of you probably have heard about the circulation of the proposal that the Collegiate Commissioners Association has passed around at this Convention. It is certainly a new paradigm of structure. I would encourage all of us not to be apprehensive about looking at new paradigms. I mentioned this the other day. Restructuring may

cause us to explore entire new approaches to this organization. Let's look at that openly.

One of my concerns about the model presented by the CCA is a reaction to the model rather than looking at other concepts and other models of organization. Let's look at all of the models that we can explore. As I mentioned the other day, I hope we can encourage the possibility of some outside experts giving us an insight into structure from a totally historically unbiased background. The difficulty in looking at new paradigms and models is trying to put a square peg in a round hole. We need to reexplore our present structure from that perspective.

One of the compounding problems from my perspective was establishing the Presidents Commission, which has been very valuable to the structure within this Association to implement the reform measures that have taken place in the last five years. We did not change the structure of the organization significantly, but we added another layer of bureaucracy to the structure. We did not change the rest of the organization, so now we have the Presidents Commission, we have the Council, we have the Executive Committee, we have one more extension of bureaucracy that has made it extremely difficult to work through and involve constituents of the Association. We need to look at that.

This Association over the years has certainly made adjustments to the needs of individual institutions. I feel we can accomplish that. But what I find exciting about this period of reorganization and evaluation is that there is much more receptivity to the consideration of a totally new structure rather than just trying to piecemeal and reorganize. I suspect we'll not totally reorganize the structure, but I hope that we do come from a different perspective from where we are now to make this a more efficient and effective Association. Those are some of the views that we have heard, but I wanted to encourage you, as I encouraged Division III yesterday, to be open and identify your problems. When we are done, if we say that the present structure works, then at least we will feel much better about it.

There is no question in Division I-A that there are many problems related to control, philosophy and direction, and the number of schools in that division. But I do not believe that it is entirely a Division I-A issue. That division gets the most media attention. From my perspective, we must look at what is best for the entire Association rather than considering what is best for one institution or one division. We should not be frightened by threats. One advantage of having been involved in this Association since the 1960s is that I have seen many threats. This period reminds me so much of 1984 when we went through the deregulation of television. There was a real threat of the Association dissolving. I do not believe that will happen. I do not believe that is in the best interest of intercollegiate athletics or individual institutions. But that does not mean we should not address the sensitivities and the issues that most of you have

Division II Business Session _____ 155

read about in the papers and that have been expressed here in the hallways.

So I really come to you this morning with a plea to look at what the needs of this division are as it fits into the total structure of the organization, and more importantly, to look at the entire organization to determine if there is a better way and if there is a better model. That is a real challenge for us, but it should be a great opportunity.

In closing, I don't believe I am speaking out of line with members of the Presidents Commission, but I sense within that Commission an interest in redesigning its focus. It is important that the presidents stay involved with the philosophy and overriding perspective of where we should be and where we are going in intercollegiate athletics. We must develop a much more proactive approach from student-athletes, coaches and administrators of intercollegiate athletics as it relates to the micromanagement, for lack of a better term, of our field. Let the Presidents Commission determine whether that fits into the total picture of what is trying to be accomplished in intercollegiate athletics and its role in higher education. I do not sense that the Presidents Commission wants to continue micromanaging in terms of determining the number of recruiting days and the various issues that it has had to take positions on.

If we are ever going to make change, we must each take ownership for that change. In order to take ownership, you must take part in the change. You must be a part of the decision-making process. I hope that through our structure that we never lose sight of the need to involve full participation of the membership in whatever changes take place. So I hope I will bring to you openness. I do not have any preformed idea at all as to where we ought to go. But I am excited about the possibility of getting somewhere collectively in a much more positive direction than might presently exist.

I enjoyed being with you. I will be happy to participate in the forum and try to answer any questions that you may have related to this area.

One other area that I'd like to touch on briefly is deregulation and decentralization. To me, that's a whole part of the restructuring concept. I strongly advocate that if we are ever going to have integrity in intercollegiate athletics, we must also have ownership for that integrity. More ownership by individuals, institutions and conferences.

If we could destroy one image of the Association in the next three years, I hope that it is that the NCAA is a police state. It should not be a police state. It should be an organization that has a strong philosophical commitment to the role of intercollegiate athletics and higher education and the integrity that is involved to accomplish that task.

It is a pleasure to be here with you this morning. I will hang around until my next meeting. We hope to have further discussion during the year to determine how we can best arrive at a total evaluation

and models for the membership to consider which is the most effective way to run the NCAA. Thank you.

Mr. Lindemann: This would be an opportune time to ask any questions that you may have regarding restructuring. Does anyone have questions or concerns in that regard?

I know it's a new topic. It's probably not something that we are all fully prepared to deal with.

Cedric, in light of the Division I commissioners proposal, there has been talk about eliminating the designations of Divisions I-AA, AAA, II, and III. In some discussions, we've been referred to as "a loose association of monetary outcasts." In that regard, we would remind our Division I-A colleagues to remember the Alamo.

Are there any questions regarding restructuring?

Cost Containment

Mr. Lindemann: The next topic is cost containment. I refer you to the cost containment surveys that were handed out yesterday and I will turn the microphone over to Janet Kittell.

Janet R. Kittell (California State University, Chico): I would like to acknowledge the efforts of the committee—Shirley Green Reese, David O'Toole, Clint Bryant, Rich Johanningmeier and our fearless leader who has been at the microphone for two days. We have had great staff support from both Cappy Powell and we have been able to rely on Steve Mallonee's experience with having worked through this at the Division I level. So they have both served us very well. We appreciate their help.

Our charge last August was to try to present to you some ideas for your consideration. We began by opening the field as widely as we could to create suggestions. We focused on cost containment, not leveling the playing field. What may be most important for me to emphasize this morning is that we need your input. These really are ideas only. We hope that it's a beginning point, not an end point. We will only go forward at the 1995 Convention with legislation if the majority of you indicate an interest in or a support for these or any other ideas that may result from this session or your responses to our survey. The other thing that's important is that nothing here is sacred. We need to be very open-minded and flexible about all of this.

I also need to extend the committee's thanks to the commissioners for their input. At their meeting in early December, they made some additions to our rough draft that are reflected in the version that you see before you. Further, they have agreed to collect the completed surveys from their respective conferences as well as from those independents for whom they administer the coaches' certification test.

We hope the final survey will be on your desks by the first of February. About 30 of you have already returned it. We certainly appreciate that. If you would like an opportunity to return another one, you have that opportunity again. The commissioners will collect the surveys. They will not tabulate results. They'll send them on to the NCAA. At our April meeting, we will be considering the responses

and the results. We will get results to you as soon as we possibly can.

I'd like to go on to the specifics of the survey at this point and open the floor for questions, suggestions or discussion. Please remember this is an interest assessment tool only. Are there concerns? Are there questions? Do you have any interest in this at all?

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): As I was filling out that survey a couple of weeks ago, I thought the questions in general were good, but I wondered if you had a sense of what this body is currently doing?

For example, you are looking at limiting official visits. You suggested an arbitrary number of 50 percent of Division I. Maybe that is appropriate. Maybe it's not. But I have no idea what this body is doing. I know what our conference is doing. I don't have any idea about the North Central or Missouri Intercollegiate. I can't say that I don't care. We do care. Would this be helpful to you in putting a final survey or whatever together? Just one example.

Ms. Kittell: Bruce, it would be very helpful. That is why we coded one, two and three on minimal savings so that when you address a specific response we could tell whether that would save you \$1,000. We would have a general idea of where you were coming from.

Mr. Allison: I guess I might ask the football-playing institutions how many official visits do you currently entertain and look at that number. I'm not looking for an average necessarily, but using that as a base and from there going to the step I think you have gone to.

Ms. Kittell: That's a very positive suggestion. We can incorporate the questions about data collection as opposed to just your opinions. Good point, Bruce. Are there other questions or concerns?

William R. Trumbo (University of Hawaii at Hilo): I reviewed the questionnaire. I know all of those areas represent expenses at various levels at various institutions. But to be quite honest, legislation doesn't tell you, you mandate what you must spend. It is up to each institution or conference. They can always spend less. For almost every one of them, other than officials, we were reducing the number from three to two. I don't know if conferences have arbitrarily decided whether there is an NCAA rule that says you must provide three or any number of officials. I guess within the rules book there were suggestions, but I know there are some conferences and some institutions that might still use just two referees.

I also think it is more important to look at those areas of mandated NCAA regulations, particularly the scheduling requirements to meet sports-sponsorship responsibilities. We are certainly one of the most isolated institutions in the NCAA. We are in the middle of the Pacific Ocean some 2,500 miles from competitive opportunities. The Association is making stronger efforts to eliminate new members from gaining membership opportunities from the NAIA to the NCAA. That was obvious yesterday in the provisional membership that has been changed.

If we are still held accountable to a certain level of competition to

be in compliance with sports sponsorship, then you eliminate the opportunities to compete against NAIA or other small-college associations to make a schedule. That is one area that the survey could address—where you have to do something and then you have no choice.

All of the other areas you have some degree of choice. If you want to save money, you can save money. But I think there are things the NCAA does not need to mandate.

Ms. Kittell: We certainly can consider putting something in there about reducing scheduling requirements to see if this body is interested in that.

I think that one of the cautions that some people might have is that quite often our regulations result in being ceilings rather than floors. We might need some help at the national level, so we all would be doing similar things and not trying to outdo the Joneses.

Peter Chapman (Wayne State College, Nebraska): When we got to part six, there was a little confusion on what our institutional response would be based on. It would be one thing if the financial aid model stayed the way it is right now in terms of what a full grant-in-aid was. It was different if you came up with a new one that was based on tuition and fees in terms of the number of financial aid awards. Do you follow what I am saying?

Ms. Kittell: No.

Mr. Chapman: If we maintained financial aid the way that it is right now, then we would have one response—an institutional response that would be based on football. But if it were based on need-based financial aid only, it would most likely be a lot greater. So it was hard to determine.

Ms. Kittell: Okay. So we need to structure parts 5 and 6 together so that you have an opportunity to answer 6 based on your answer to 5-A or 5-B?

Mr. Chapman: Right. If it was need-based tuition only or if it is full grant-in-aid the way it is right now.

Ms. Kittell: If the group went with 5-A, this would be your response to 6. And if they went to 5-B—great suggestion. Are there other comments or suggestions? Seeing no other comments or questions, what I, the committee and the Council would be interested in is a straw vote on the answer to the very first part—the general question, which is: "Does your institution support the concept of national regulation for Division II to contain costs in intercollegiate athletics?"

We can get some valuable information from you. But without the answer to that question, we don't know how far you would like us to go. Can we take a straw vote on that? If I can see a show of paddles or hands. Does your institution support the concept of national regulation in regard to cost containment? Okay. And those of you who are opposed to that national regulation? That is very helpful.

William E. Lide (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): Janet, we might want to determine the degree of support. Some peo-

ple may say support, but it might be minimal. Some may have a moderate view. Some may feel it is strongly needed. That may also help the committee to know the extent of the support at this time.

Ms. Kittell: Are you suggesting that in our straw vote we do sort of an A, B, C, D—strongly support, support?

Mr. Lide: Yes. Instead of the general thing, you have them listed in order based on preference. Just ask about each one in its entirety of that segment.

Ms. Kittell: It appears that there was general support for the overall concept that we have presented.

With regard to recruiting, do you support restrictions that would be cost-containment oriented in the area of recruiting? Those of you who are supportive of recruiting limitations would you raise your paddles, please? Those of you who are opposed to national legislation regarding recruiting? Those of you who don't care?

James H. Jordan (Delta State University): If everybody goes to tuition and fee scholarships, those folks who get a Pell Grant keep the whole thing. The kids can keep all of it. I really like this. I hope that you will look at tuition scholarships. I think it makes for a more equal playing field for everybody.

Herb F. Reinhard III (Valdosta State University): I too would like to ask the committee if we are going to study this. Are we going to survey this? Let's study and survey things that are going to make a difference. Reducing official visits is trivial. It's not going to save money. Our budgets are so different in this room. If we are going to spend time studying things, let's spend time studying things that are indeed going to make a difference—the meat of this.

Let's look at need-based financial aid, instead of looking at decreasing the number of basketball officials from three to two. I don't know about the rest of you, but for us that's not going to save us any money.

Ms. Kittell: Well, Herb, I think that is the whole point. We do want to address those things that are truly of concern to the membership. I think that the point that Bruce made earlier is very well taken. We can establish exactly where we are, but your institution may not save any money that way. We don't know that yet. Until we know that, we can't come forth with the important issues and eliminate those issues that the membership deems unimportant.

We are certainly willing to do what we think the body believes is the right thing. Until we have that information, we can't know what the right thing is.

David L. Suenram (California State University, San Bernardino): I want to back up what that gentleman said. Let's study things that are going to make a difference. The gentleman from Hawaii-Hilo pointed out a lot of the things you are talking about—such as NCAA-mandated ceilings. Most of us regulate our own budget based upon the money that we have available to spend. For many of us, the questions in that survey aren't meaningful because we are not doing those things anyway. We are not doing a lot of official visits. Those

kinds of things aren't going to help most of us. The things that are of genuine interest are things such as travel costs for those of us in the West. We no longer have enough Division II teams to play. We have to go to Colorado to play people to meet our scheduling requirements to get a fair rating for national ranking and national competition.

It would help us a lot if we would look at being required to play 18 games against NCAA Division II competition. Maybe if that were less, that's something that would help us.

One more thing. We don't need to eliminate, but we need to reduce the amount of influence that coaches on committees have in determining scheduling requirements. I think we need to look at things that are real and meaningful to us. I don't think we always do that.

Ms. Kittell: We will include the scheduling requirements as a part of this. If you have some very specific suggestions about the subcomponent parts of that, Dave, please get them to us.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): I agree with the last two speakers. They got up and said exactly what I feel.

I think there is indifference out here because most of these are trivial things. They really are. I had this thing all typed and ready to mail in. Then I finally read the fine print and realized we brought it with us. But I asked: "When do we get serious about cost containment?" If it's necessary. We all have different situations. There are some Division II programs that I think are doing rather well financially. As you know, in our conference we are not doing too well.

But nothing is mentioned about reducing football scholarships. Does Division II—and I am kind of a football person, as you know—have to give 38 scholarships for equivalencies? Off-campus recruiting. If you eliminated off-campus recruiting in Division II, you would save money. The things that we have answered on the survey really are not going to make any difference in most programs.

I also—heaven help us—suggest restricted-substitution football might make a huge difference in Division II and the cost. I don't know that we need to play with 80 or 90 football players. Perhaps we could play with 60 football players.

There are some significant things that are not even addressed on this. They are kind of provocative. Some people that would fall over backwards if we talked about single-platoon football and letting one athlete in football play beyond the 13 minutes he currently plays.

I was the NCAA liaison to the A&M-Kingsville-UC Davis playoff game. I watched some unbelievably great athletes. I know very well that some of the defensive backs at A&M-Kingsville would make great receivers. We happen to have an offensive tackle on our team that will go in the first round of the NFL draft. I kept telling our coaches to play him on defense. There is no way this 6-4, 305 pound guy isn't better than every defensive line man you have. Let him play more than 13 minutes. He's a great athlete. But I don't know that we will ever address that subject in Division II. But if we do, we'll start saving some money.

Ms. Kittell: Ralph, I think we certainly can make this survey more radical. We tried not to address proposals already on the floor of this Convention. For instance, you have already passed Proposal 16 and the resolution for need-based financial aid. We also tried not to duplicate questions about limited squad sizes. So we can certainly reincorporate those ideas into the survey. We have no reluctance at all about doing that.

I have a note from one of my esteemed colleagues to please return with the survey a list of items not included and/or suggestions for those things that we should include. You can certainly get those to any of the Council members or either Steve Mallonee or Cappy Powell before we leave or at a later date.

Keith R. Phillips (Seattle Pacific University): I would like to simply reinforce the comments made about the ability of coaches associations to enact requirements that drive costs upward. For example, the NCAA requirement for scheduling men's and women's basketball is 14 games to be a member. But yet the coaches association has been given the liberty to require 18. That is not cost containment. That's driving our costs up substantially. As we talk about cost containment, let's talk about those regulations or permissive activities that are going to cost us more and make sure that we don't allow those kinds of things to happen because those are some significant costs.

We could contain cost by scheduling fewer games, but we are required to play 18 in Division I and II. For some schools, that's not a hardship. They can get in their van and play games every week. For some of the rest of us, that means flying all over the United States to try to find those 18 games. That is extremely cost prohibitive. So we have to really follow that train of thought and look at those things that can make a huge difference for some of us. It would be greatly appreciated.

Ms. Kittell: If there are specific suggestions in those areas, please give us that in writing.

Richard A. Johanningsmeier (Washburn University of Topeka): In working with this committee, there are only a couple of areas where major savings can be made. One is in staff and personnel salaries. The other is in scholarships. There are some radical changes here, but no one seems to get up to the microphone to address them. The only way we can address staff salaries is to use current staff members to coach other sports to help us with gender equity and to move closer to proportionality and the right thing to do. That may mean in a lot of situations eliminating the nontraditional type of season and going back to a different model.

The other area is the scholarship issue. It really boils down to a redistribution of the resources that we currently have. As you all know, we don't have the option of dealing with CBS to get a playoff to help Division II bring in more revenue to help offset some of these costs. So some of the major issues have been there, but not in specific form.

We are hoping that you will all help us with some direction in these areas. We realize that in some institutions there are certain minimal savings made and in others there are large savings.

So again, the two main areas are personnel and staff, which may trickle down into a lot of different areas and force us to do things differently.

Nathan N. Salant (Gulf South Conference): I am hearing a great deal about containment and trying to save money. Realistically speaking, for institutions that play football, the only cost containment that will have any real impact is dropping football. Nobody wants to do that.

If you really want to talk cost containment, let's not talk nickels and dimes. I hear people talking about tuition only or I hear people talking about need-based aid. Without getting into the philosophy, that is called Division III. That is an option some institutions could choose to pursue.

Division II is supposed to be something different. Maybe this gets at something that we don't talk enough about. What is Division II supposed to be? We might get 50 different answers if we asked that question. I think that is a base issue that has to be addressed between your committee and restructuring.

The other thing that I find very frustrating—and I raised this at the Division II commissioner's meeting—is I never hear anyone say: "What can we do to create Division II revenue." Why do we have to use—I realize this would be a major change in NCAA rules—the Rawlings basketball if we could go to another company and get a Division II deal?

Ms. Kittell: We can right now. We can use whatever we want. But they will use the Rawlings basketball in the national tournament. We therefore have been pressured by our coaches to use the Rawlings at home.

Mr. Salant: But my point is—I realize we would need to change the rule—why can't we propose a different basketball for our championship and get some revenue for Division II?

Ms. Kittell: We can. You want to use a different basketball?

Mr. Salant: I am saying let's look for opportunities and ways to raise money. That's all I am saying. We do nothing to look at raising money for Division II.

Ms. Kittell: We would be happy to do that. Put a list of your concerns together.

We really do thank you all for your input. We would be more than happy to incorporate just as much as we can into the survey. How long of a survey are you willing to fill out? We will absolutely use your input. I thank you very much for your thoughtful responses.

[The meeting was recessed for 10 minutes.]

Certification

Mr. Lindemann: Ladies and gentlemen, the topic before us is athletics certification. I am about to invite Delta State University

Division II Business Session _____ 163

President Kent Wyatt to talk about the Presidents Commission and Council joint committee working paper on institutional certification.

This is going to be an opportunity for you to provide some feedback to that group about those elements of certification or whether the certification program is in our interests and what it ought to contain.

So please welcome Kent Wyatt.

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): The Presidents Commission ordered a joint committee to study the concept of athletics certification in Division II.

This joint committee had representation from the Division II Steering Committee. Harold, Diane, Rita and Rich represented the Steering Committee on that committee. On the Presidents Commission we had Thomas Clark, Jay McGowan and Diane Ramaley. We have utilized our staff people and we have utilized our consultant to make contacts with all the regional accrediting agencies throughout the country to try to find out how they could participate and how they would assist if we go to the route for certification.

You were presented yesterday with a yellow sheet that outlines a very raw presentation of an idea that possibly could be utilized if we go to certification in Division II. Our intent was to try to make this as cost effective as possible. We wanted the least cost to the institution as we possibly could and to utilize our regional-accredited bodies when they make their 10-year evaluation of your institution.

We felt that after an intense study of each of the different seven regional accredited bodies that there was such little uniformity in what each did that it would not provide us with any meaningful certification throughout the United States by trying to follow that method. We are going to work with each of these seven regional-accredited bodies to see if we could move to something with that type of procedure. But at the present time, there is so much difference there that we don't feel that it would work for our Division II certification process.

On page two of the handout, you see a suggestion that we have brought to you for discussion. We brought this same presentation to the presidents of Division II when they met in the luncheon on Sunday. The presidents have many suggestions for us and new ideas to look at. The general consensus of the presidents group was that we need to continue to look toward certification, but we may need to look at different ways of doing it. So this is one idea that is presented to you. As you know, right now you are required every five years to do an in-house institutional self-study. What this would do is continue that five-year in-house self-study, but once every 10 years it would be a peer review and a little more involved.

We are trying to look at such things as governments and commitment to compliance, academic integrity, fiscal integrity and commitment to equity. There would be some type of a procedure established for review. It could be a one-, two- or three-person team coming to your campus to evaluate what you have done. There would also be

some type of sanctions that would be levied against an institution that did not meet the proper certification requirements.

So we bring this for discussion purposes only. It is the intent of the committee to take your recommendations that we receive today and recommendations that you will mail into our Division II staff person, Steve Mallonee, and utilize those for further discussion. We then can perhaps develop legislation for either the 1995 or 1996 annual Convention.

That's the general overview of where we are. I would be pleased to receive any suggestions or discussion that you might have.

Noel W. Olson (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I am pleased with what I see on here. I think it's very appropriate for Division II and not an overdone document. As the chair of the commissioners association, I would indicate to you that we stand ready to assist and wonder if there was a reason why a commissioner couldn't be on the evaluation team on page three of number five?

Mr. Wyatt: I think that's a very appropriate suggestion, thank you.

Joseph T. Donahue (California State University, Stanislaus): A number of us are wondering why there is nothing on this document asking if this is even necessary for Division II.

It appears that we are accepting the fact that certification should happen in our division. While Division I has gone this route, I don't believe, and many of my colleagues have discussed it, that this is necessary for our people. I have seen no compelling evidence to tell us that we need this. Isn't it accreditation that we adhere to now year in and year out? No other part of our institution has to deal with the regulations that we deal with on a yearly basis. By adhering to these rules year in and year out, that in itself is the best example of accreditation that I can see that we now do. Why give ourselves more unnecessary burden and work by having to deal with a group coming to our campus once every 10 years to tell us we are doing a good job of what we are already doing? Let's get rid of this whole idea and proceed with business as usual.

Mr. Wyatt: Thank you. Ideally, that would be great.

Rory Lee (Mississippi College): I believe I can give you a reason why we need this by stating where I am from—Mississippi College.

At our institution, there was turmoil because our athletics program was out of control. This was voted on by the presidents. There were over 40 presidents there. No president voted against it. Not one. I believe eight did abstain, but every president voted for this because they need to know what's happening in athletics. If this is tied in with the regional accrediting agency visit, then it is putting athletics on the same ground as the academics of the institution. It gives the athletics program the opportunity to be evaluated just as the academic program is evaluated. If a person has nothing to hide, the cost is minimal—\$3,000 once every 10 years. If the self-study is being done anyway, all you are doing is getting a peer review on that self-study.

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): As I read through this, I kept putting little dollar signs by it. I know the gentleman just referred to the \$3,000 figure. I might ask if there is any other cost considerations. I know when Division I got into certification, the cost was minimal in the initial stages and then it became substantial.

Mr. Wyatt: Correct.

Mr. Fallis: Rather than jump into this and start moving forward in such a way that there is a significant cost rather than a minimal cost, we might want to take a cautious road. We could select some institutions, much like Division I did, and actually go through the process of certification. They could tell us what the real costs are, much like they did in Division I.

We do have a process by which we can approach the Association to evaluate our programs. I think we have some things available to us. I listened to the first speaker and I understand where he is coming from. Then I listened to the gentleman from Mississippi College and I understand that, too. But I just think we need to be careful. I know that when we go through the 10-year regional certification accreditation program, that that doesn't come out of the academic programs. I've never seen it in my years of higher education come out of the academic program. The universities somehow found the money to put somebody on staff to deal with that accreditation group for the time that they were there.

I guess I'd like to see the presidents go a step further if they are adamant about this. Let them take it out of their budget because I have got a feeling it is going to come out of something called the "athletics administration budget." I am not sure we have got the funds, whether it is \$3,000 or \$30,000.

But I would hope that if they continue to move in that direction, that they set aside the funding for that in such a way that it doesn't—even though it is once every 10 years—inconvenience the athletics programs.

Mr. Wyatt: I think a pilot study would be a good idea. The committee felt that a very thorough self-study costs around \$3,000 to \$4,000. But if you don't do a very thorough self-study, it is going to be more expensive to you in the long run.

Keith R. Phillips (Seattle Pacific University): I tend to agree with the gentleman who expressed concern about excessive work and evaluations and challenged the necessity of this. But on the other hand, all of us who have been in higher education for many years realize that institutions are driven on the basis of credibility.

The key to credibility is being involved with accreditation with our various professional organizations and associations. It would seem to me that we have always struggled on our campuses in intercollegiate athletics with credibility. This could help us if this is done in a very forthright and professional manner, as are other accrediting exercises that could help us substantially in developing a better reputation and a sense of credibility on our own campuses.

The second observation is under No. 7, where it talks about sanctions. To keep in the spirit of other accreditations, typically accreditations after the visit and after the committee review will come back and tell you where your weaknesses are and what you need to do to strengthen your programs. Rather than talk about sanctions, we ought to follow the same procedure. Rather than seeing this as a punitive experience or approach, let's take a helpful and constructive approach. Let's get our recommendation. If after some kind of review or revisit there are serious problems that over a particular period of time have not been heeded or corrected, there would be some kind of sanction. I think that intermediate step of recommendations would be much more constructive and helpful than simply waiting for the hammer to drop after the visit.

Mr. Wyatt: Thank you, good suggestion. Of course, Dr. Dempsey spoke to us just a few minutes ago about integrity in athletics. This would be one way to certify that we do have that integrity and get that information out to the general public through that certification process.

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): I have been in on the discussions in the Presidents Commission since the beginning of them. I thought I'd just share some of the major concerns that the presidents have had in their discussions over the last couple of years.

I know there are some of you, it's quite obvious by the reaction, who are opposed to this process. When the topic came up, all of the presidents agreed immediately that we did not want to get into a complicated or expensive process such as the one followed by Division I. That was the No. 1 concern.

But I think the reason the discussions have continued was well-stated by our colleague from Mississippi College. That was one of the prime cases, but there were some others. We thought if we are going to have a division with integrity—and we all can have confidence that we have the most-even playing field that we possibly can have—some kind of a process is necessary. As the discussions go on in the next year, all of you can evaluate whether the costs are as low as they can be. There also was concern about the time it would take and the effort that the athletics director and members of the athletics staff would have to put forth. That is why the presidents wanted to combine the athletics certification process with the regular accreditation process—so that there isn't a lot of extra work. At least the work is minimized. It is not a totally separate process from college and university accreditation itself.

So I think those two guidelines are pretty well fixed in the whole process. Someone mentioned that this was inevitable. It certainly is on a track, but I wouldn't say that it's inevitable. I wouldn't say that. I think everyone wants to examine it. As our colleague from Mississippi College said about the presidents in their meeting the other day. There were only 40 of them, but that was a pretty good sample

who think we have to work towards this. Yet no one is certain how it must be done. So there is still a lot of room for suggestions.

But I think to blindly say we are okay and what we do is okay is not going to fly in the long run. To be a division with integrity—and the gentleman who just spoke is right on target—is what's important. As this division moves into the future, it needs that integrity component that certification might give.

So I hope, as Ced Dempsey has been pleading, that we have open minds. Those who are opposed, just keep your minds open. There is no one on the Presidents Commission who wants to railroad anything through or has a fixed idea of how it should be. We are all groping toward a system that will ensure the most integrity we can possibly have.

Mr. Wyatt: Thank you, Don, for giving us that good overview. Don has represented us as chair of the Division II Presidents Commission Subcommittee. He has really stood tall for Division II against some of the activities that were taking place in the Presidents Commission that would have had a negative effect over us. We owe Don a round of applause for his services. (Applause)

Robert A. Barrett (Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne): Credibility. Integrity. You have got a group sitting there that you may want to tap. I would suggest that you utilize the vast expertise that is sitting in the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association.

I think those people would really love to help you. A lot of us have got experience in writing the documents and of going through the accreditation process. I think FARA could lend a really good supporting hand at the college level. There is your credibility and integrity.

Mr. Wyatt: Thank you. We really hadn't considered that. Thank you.

Hugh C. Bailey (Valdosta State University): I think we should be very careful in the actual visitation and evaluation process in keeping reasonable accreditation separated from the process of this particular evaluation. We have enough complexity and rules and regional accrediting groups.

We have many other specialized accreditations. They have been very careful, even though they may be concurrent visits, to keep the evaluation separate. While I think concurrent visits would be very good, we have different rules in the NCAA than the regional accreditation rule. We should be very careful in keeping the valuation separate, even though the visits could be made concurrently.

Mr. Wyatt: Thank you, President Bailey. Something tells me our time is about up. Let me reaffirm my first statement to you. We welcome your input. Please write to Steve Mallonee at the NCAA national office with any suggestion that you have. We welcome that. We will try to implement that into our studies.

Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse

Mr. Lindemann: We now will have two speakers. Ollie Bowman

is going to give you a report on where the clearinghouse stands and be prepared to respond to questions that you may have about that. Rich Johanningmeier is going to give you information on our graduation-persistence rates study and what's going on there.

Ollie M. Bowman (Hampton University): I'd like to share some things with you about the initial-eligibility clearinghouse. I didn't realize how uneven the playing field has been in initial eligibility until we started turning this thing over to the clearinghouse.

Most of you know that we enacted legislation two years ago to establish the clearinghouse. Last year was an optional year. You didn't have to use it if you didn't want to. But all our athletes coming in this fall must be cleared through the clearinghouse. We have a lot of work to do, gang. There is something like 25,000 high schools in this country, but only 12,000 have filed their 48-H Forms with the clearinghouse. There has been something like 21,700 prospective student-athletes who have filed their release forms with the clearinghouse.

On those release forms, the student is given two options. When they sign their release form and send in the \$18, they check one of two options. They can release their information to any institution that requests their information or they can specify the institution. Of the 22,000 kids who have sent in their forms, 600 of them have specified the schools. Back in August, ACT sent institutions a release form. I think as of yesterday afternoon, of the 245 Division II institutions, only 117 have returned those forms. That form lists the primary contact and four other people who could receive information. Nobody can be certified this fall unless they come through the clearinghouse. The clearinghouse will only release preliminary clearances to institutions that have been authorized to receive information by the student. This morning, we defeated a proposal to allow the institution to pay the \$18 to register a walk-on. Many of you who have done certifications know that sometimes there is a coach standing at your door with the motor running and the bus waiting to take this kid to play. If he doesn't have \$18, he doesn't play. That was your choice.

I did not realize how unlevel the field was until we heard some of the feedback from the high schools. I want to share this with you for general information. The NCAA went to great pains on the 48-H Form to list what constitutes a core course. Business English is not one. Accounting is not one. Sign language is not a foreign language. The high schools are up in arms because up until this clearinghouse appeared these courses were accepted. They were quite concerned that courses that were accepted by their educational institutions for graduation are no longer being accepted. These are things that have been brought to our attention from feedback that is coming from the high schools.

We just met yesterday. We are going to meet again the first of next month. I can only hope that those of you who have not filed the institutional forms will please get them in, because starting in April, the

clearinghouse will request from the athletics directors the persons on your campuses who will be authorized to receive the 48-H Forms. Thank you. Any questions?

Enrollment and Persistence Rates

Richard A. Johanningmeier (Washburn University of Topeka): This will be very brief. Hopefully, it will enlighten you about some of the findings that the Division II study on academic performance came forth with in its first analysis of data.

The purpose of this ongoing study is the basis upon which Division I has implemented a number of their initial-eligibility rules. This is the first time that Division II has actually had an analysis of its academic performance. The purpose of the study is to investigate the potential positive and negative effects of different eligibility rules for student-athletes. It is not a comparison of institution against institution or any other types of situations. We are just trying to find out if the legislation that we have in place is doing what we want it to do in regards to initial eligibility.

The data that has been collected for this study is on the class that entered in 1986 before NCAA legislation required a qualifying-test score or a minimum grade-point average for participation. This is our first group in the study. The 1986 data is valuable because student-athletes were not declared ineligible by the current cutoffs, so all had the opportunity of full participation in Division II programs. The performance of these student-athletes is now available for up to five years of college including graduation.

The following are some of the results of the study: In 1986, 45 percent of Division II student-athletes scored below 749 on the SAT and 15.3 on the ACT. Comparing those results nationally: approximately 15 to 20 percent of all entrants in 1986 would have scored below 15.3 on the ACT or 749 on the SAT; 56 percent of Division II student-athletes in the 1986 class ranked in the lower half of their high-school classes; 72.3 percent of Division II student-athletes had core grade-point averages below 2.92; and 11.7 percent of Division II student-athletes in 1986 had core grade-point averages below a 1.90.

Of this group that had grade-point averages below 1.90, only 14 percent of those graduated. Division II student-athletes as a whole were approximately one standard deviation below the national average of 3.0 for grade-point averages for incoming freshmen, so our athletes had about a 2.5 grade-point average across the board.

Black males had the poorest survival rate, nearly 50 percent were lost in the first two years. Females survived at the highest rate, approximately 91 percent during the first two years were still in school.

The better the high-school grade-point average, the better the survival rate. The adjusted graduation rate, which excludes students who left in good academic standing, was 52.6 percent for the 1986 group. The five-year unadjusted graduation rate was 35.6 percent. A standard of a 2.0 grade-point average and a 15 on the ACT or 700 on the SAT test score would have eliminated between 12 to 20 percent

of the sample at the cut point. The grade-point average and test score cut points were closer in Division II than in Division I. One of the facts that came out of the Division I study was that the 2.0 grade-point average was virtually eliminating no one. The only thing that was eliminating Division I student-athletes from participation at the time was the test score. So our test score and our grade-point average is closer and does match up as far as cutting and putting the elimination factor into play.

Initially, only 42 percent of sample schools reported, but subsequent follow-ups by the NCAA staff has increased a percentage of sample schools to 58 percent, which appears to be a representative sample.

In conclusion, the Research Committee requests your assistance in submitting the requested information from your institution for this study. With the ongoing study and the information that becomes available to the research staff, we can in the future base our decisions on initial-eligibility legislation on the available data and make the right decisions for our student-athletes.

So again, this is the first study. We will have more information. I am sure that none of us are real proud about some of those statistics. We do look for a vast improvement and increase in the next group when we study where the initial eligibility for grade point and SAT or ACT score came in.

Mr. Lindemann: Our final presenter today is Jerry Hughes, who chairs the championships committee. I think Jerry will be prepared to talk with you about how we are dealing with regionalization and other issues related to championships. He's also prepared to take questions about anything relating to championships. I know he can handle it. He's tough.

Championships

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): My remarks in regard to championships will be a very brief overview of some of the things that the championships committee and Executive Committee have done in the past year. At that point, if any of you have questions regarding championships, I will be happy to field them. I have some other people up here who can help deflect some of those shots.

The NCAA Division II Championships Committee has as its primary responsibility the administration of the Division II championships program, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee. I served as the chair of that committee this past year. Also on that committee with me are Clint Bryant from Augusta College, Rita Castagna from Assumption College, Chuck Lindemann from Humboldt State and Noel Olson from the North Central Conference.

During the 1992-93 academic year a total of 563 teams and 4,796 student-athletes competed in the 22 men's and women's championships at the Division II level. Sixty-two percent of the Division II membership had either a team or an individual competing in an NCAA championship.

With regard to finances, participating institutions were reimbursed approximately \$2.8 million for transportation and \$1.3 million for per diem during that time. It should be noted that transportation expenses for the Division II championships participants increased about 17 percent this past year. Some of the major issues that we addressed this past year after the comprehensive championship study was bracket expansion. I think you all know that we established bracket sizes for championships based upon the percentage of member institutions sponsoring this sport to ensure that the field sizes for men's and women's championships were comparable.

Bracket and field sizes for the 1993-94 championships were increased as follows: Women's volleyball was increased from 20 to 28 teams; women's softball from 16 to 24 teams; women's cross country from 92 to 132 individuals; women's tennis from 70 to 90 individuals, and women's outdoor track from 170 to 220 individuals.

Another topic that we discussed last year during our championships overview and studied fully this year was the basketball play-in situation. One of the concerns that the membership survey indicated to the championships committee was access. You wanted access to the championships, even if it meant paying your own dime.

We established a basketball play-in that was developed by the men's and women's basketball committees and forwarded to the championships committee. As a result, this spring we will be conducting 16 play-in games for the 1994 championships.

The conditions for the play-ins are as follows: Participating institutions will be responsible for the administrative expenses, transportation and per diem expenses. Host institutions will not receive an honorarium and any net receipts will be pooled and redistributed to the participating institutions to offset transportation first and then per diem.

The committee continued to move on with the concept of regionalization. The concept of regionalization has been a continuing topic of discussion for the committee. It has been the philosophy of the committee that due to the limited amount of interregional competition and comparative data between teams located at different regions of the country, every effort should be made to select teams for championship competition on a regional basis.

In brief, the concept of regionalization that went into effect for the 1993-94 championships requires that all committees select and pair teams within their regions.

This has been a very brief overview of some of the things we have done on the championships committee this past year.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact myself, any member of the committee, or Dennis Poppe, NCAA director of championships, at the national office. I would be happy to field any questions about championships, basketball play-ins or anything along those lines.

Richard A. Kaiser (Western State College of Colorado): You may

not be able to answer this. With the per diem now being either or in indoor-outdoor track, is there a possibility for an institution to choose to have a per diem split?

Mr. Hughes: No, it is not possible. That discussion came out when we were looking at expanding the brackets for all the championships. For all the women's championships, we were providing more opportunities. It just comes down to dollars. We consider that many of those athletes are the same athletes in indoor and outdoor, though we do realize there are a few different ones. So we gave institutions that option. It was a way for us to recover approximately about a million dollars.

Herb F. Reinhard III (Valdosta State University): You gave us figures for travel and per diem cost and a percentage increase on the travel that went up. Do you have any revenue figures for the championships for 1992-93 versus the previous year?

Mr. Hughes: I don't have those with me. Chuck, can you remember what those were?

Mr. Lindemann: Real close to the same.

Mr. Hughes: Our revenue went up a little bit. For Division II, I think we have about a two-percent loss difference based upon revenue and expense. That was in The NCAA News, but I don't have those figures with me today.

William E. Lide (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): One of the things that continues to concern me is the selection process as far as scheduling is concerned in terms of teams being selected for it. In the name of cost containment, we are responsible to ensure that we are being prudent in our costs, yet make sure that whenever possible our teams are given postseason opportunities.

The thing that continues to bother me is that we are not pressured in any way outside of our conference to participate or play against teams that may be out of our region. I am concerned because of the strength of schedule situation that continuously haunts many of us. What kind of discussion are you having regarding that?

Mr. Hughes: About contests within regions? There has been consideration. We did discuss that at our last meeting in December. We are going to be sending information back to the sports committees.

As some of the people indicated earlier today, the number of contests to be selected for the championships is a concern depending on the regions and the travel involved. It is important for the sports committees to review the number of contests within the region—a certain percentage—and there has been certain percentages thrown out. I don't want to throw any out today. But I know some sports committees are looking at that X-number of contests must be against teams in your region.

I think that would solve some of the concerns. As I say, this is a new ball game that we are moving into. But I think that is something we do need to move toward, making sure there is interregional play.

Anne Goodman James (Northern Michigan University): Has your discussion of regionalization been limited to team sports or is there any indication for individual sports as well?

Mr. Hughes: There has been discussion of individual sports, obviously. The sports committees and the numbers of individual sports are a little more difficult from time to time. There is a number selected per region. I think if you look at any of the championships handbooks on individual sports there is a number selected per region, except in some sports where you have times or distances—such as track and field or swimming, where you have certain marks that must be met to get in the championship.

Nathan N. Salant (Gulf South Conference): First, to echo Bill Lide's comments before. We are also very concerned about the lack of pressure to compete against nonconference opponents, particularly in the sports of football and basketball but in other sports as well.

Because of that lack of pressure in our area of the country, some of our members have difficulty getting Division II football and basketball games and almost reach the point where getting the 18 contests becomes difficult unless you are willing to pay significant guarantees to bring people in from other parts of the country. Again, you are not getting intraregion opponents.

We would like to see more of an emphasis on that. Even if it came down to actually trying to create legislation to force more of that type of competition. I am wondering if you can get anymore specific than your general comment before?

Mr. Hughes: I do know that there has been numbers. Clint, what were we talking about? What was that number? There was discussion once that 80 percent of your contests must be played within your region. As this has all evolved, everything just has to continue to fall in line. I think the members of the football and basketball sports committees and various sports committees staying out here should take heed of that as one of the things that the championships committee has expressed concern about. But we have to get that from the sports committees that have sent them to us. I think your remarks are accurate. I think they are something we need to look at.

Clint Bryant (Augusta College): The regionalization concept is something that Division II has wholeheartedly discussed for the past two years. I think the championships committee has worked very hard with the help of Noel Olson, with his many years of being involved in championships play.

The regionalization concept now is understood a lot by the committee, several presidents and some athletics directors. Our biggest challenge over the next year is to get the regionalization concept accepted by all involved. Our coaches and athletics directors are going to have to buy in wholeheartedly to the regionalization concept where we are definitely going to have to compete against Division II people in our region. We're therefore going to try to decide in the upcoming months on what would be a fair percentage of games that Di-

vision II people will have to play without taking away the possibility for trips or for traditional rivalries.

I think the championships committee is right on now, but we need your input and your help on any suggestions that might get us in that direction.

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): Since we have taken the indoor-outdoor track situation and said there would be reimbursement for one or the other, has thought been given to doing this after the fact? The reason I ask that question, in indoor track you have your qualification standards. Indoor track conditions don't change, the lights don't go off, the heat doesn't go off, those kinds of things.

Outdoor track qualifying depends in some cases in some areas on the weather. I didn't know if that might be a possibility that the institution could pay all of their own expenses, but at that point in time when the outdoor championship is over, they can still ask for one or the other early if they felt comfortable with it. If they are in the South, they could wait until after we know where the numbers qualify.

Mr. Hughes: That's a good point. We have requested that as a championships committee. We will continue to request that because from year to year you don't always know whether you are going to have more from indoor or outdoor.

What we run into—and being quite candid—is the bureaucracy of the staff wanting to do that in the accounting offices. We will continue to look at that.

Peter Chapman (Wayne State College, Nebraska): We agree with regionalization and everything else that's coming about. But as one of the few and diminishing number of Division II independents that play football, has the committee taken into account anything to do with what we are sitting at when people talk about playing 80 percent within your region? I know there are some independents in this country in football that that's not possible because you can't do it.

We sit in a region that has two 10-team conferences, which allows two nonconference games for schools within that conference. It is hard for us to schedule. I think in our region there are two independents. I am sure that's likewise, but has the committee paid any attention to the independent situation?

Mr. Hughes: The championships committee has looked at that. It is a concern I know that football needs to address.

Mr. Chapman: Criteria exists in most things within the selection committees. Basketball is heavily geared toward the conference structure. There seems to be very little attention paid to the independent situation.

Mr. Hughes: I think you are accurate with those comments. I do think we need to continue to look at that.

Mr. Hughes: Any further questions? I am still standing, Chuck. Thank you very much. If you have any comments or input, please

feel free to contact any of us on the championships committee. I get calls from you from time to time and I am always happy to get them. Thank you very much.

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Lindemann: Ladies and gentlemen, we are about to conclude our business. I would note for you that the clearinghouse has a booth outside the main meeting area of our general session. Since we will not reconvene after lunch, those of you that have not interacted as fully as you might with the clearinghouse might find it appropriate to stop by there.

I would now accept a motion to adjourn.

[The Division II business session was adjourned at noon.]

■ Division III Business Session

Monday Morning, January 10, 1994

The Division III business session was called to order at 8:16 a.m., with Division III Vice-President John Harvey, Carnegie-Mellon University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Harvey: If the delegates would take their seats, we would like to begin this morning's Division III business session. Good morning. Welcome to today's business session.

Joining me on the dais are Armin Langholz, faculty athletics representative at Capital University, who will serve as our parliamentarian. Dan Dutcher is a member of the NCAA staff. He has been serving us faithfully. He is here to help us work through any problems.

Our task this morning between now and 1 p.m. is to complete the Presidential Agenda Day portion of the agenda for the Division III business session.

[Note: Various announcements were made and the electronic voting procedures were explained.]

I would like to make a few comments before proceeding into the business session. First, I want to praise the excellent work of the Division III Steering Committee during the past year. Not many people realize or understand how much work a position on the committee requires. Our members are known for deep discussions and rather long meetings. I always feel very confident that we got to the heart of the matter when we finish our steering committee meetings. These members have been very diligent. I personally want to thank them for the effort they have put in this year. Also, Dan Dutcher of the NCAA office has been a very tireless coworker with the steering committee and an excellent guide for me through the sometimes intricate procedures that we have. So, thank you, Dan.

Let me comment on the legislation we have before us today and tomorrow. While it isn't a long list, there are some very important proposals. Each offers its own benefits. We want to consider those fully, as we normally do. Beyond the legislation, we have one major discussion topic—the possible restructuring of our divisions. In my mind, this is the topic of the upcoming year, just as gender equity was this past year. Let me also say how important I feel it is for Division III delegates to maintain this division's individual position on matters of principle and philosophy. This is the strongest and most distinctive

characteristic we have in Division III. Time and again, I have noticed in our steering committee's discussions and in Presidents Commission meetings this independence of thought and principle maintained and prove to be of great value in the total picture of maintaining a balance in the NCAA. I want to encourage the continuance of the tradition that we have developed in Division III of good individual thinking on proposals and basing our thoughts on principle. This has really been of value to us. I think most of you realize that. We need to actively continue to express our position in this philosophical spectrum. If we did not, the NCAA perspective would be too narrow. Our sound principles have been of benefit not only to Division III, but often to the student-athletes and institutions of all divisions. I want to encourage your continued use of this strength.

We are now prepared to receive two committee reports. For the first report, I would like to introduce Marjorie Giles, faculty athletics representative, Central College (Iowa), who will give the report of the Division III Steering Committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Steering Committee

Marjorie B. Giles (Central College, Iowa): Thank you, John. Colleagues, the Division III Steering Committee consists of 11 members who are listed with the rest of the NCAA Council in the Convention Notice.

On behalf of the steering committee, I am pleased to present the summary of our work during 1993. One of our focuses during 1993 was gender equity. In particular, we tried to identify practical ways to help institutions achieve the goals identified by the Gender-Equity Task Force. We developed a survey that Division III institutions can use to assess the interests of women about participating in intercollegiate athletics. We are forwarding the survey to the Committee on Women's Athletics for its review. The final survey will be publicized in *The NCAA News* and included in the new gender-equity source book. We also drafted legislation to specify what the purpose and function of the senior woman administrator should be and have forwarded it to the Committee on Women's Athletics for consideration as legislation for next year.

Another topic we focused on was Division III membership. As we discussed during last year's Convention, Division III has experienced significant growth during the last 10 years. We also continued to encounter difficulty with the waiver process for new members. As we began to consider solutions to this problem, we discovered that our Division II colleagues also were wrestling with this dilemma. For the first time, the Division II Steering Committee held joint meetings to attempt to solve this problem. With the help of the Association's membership coordinator, we developed provisional membership Proposal No. 14 as a practical solution to this problem. I urge you to support this legislation during this afternoon's general business session.

Of course, the pending review of the Association's membership structure also occupied a significant amount of our time. We concluded that it would be best to clarify the Division III philosophy so that any restructuring of our division is consistent with that philosophy. We recommended that a task force be appointed to review and, if necessary, recommend revisions to the Division III philosophy statement. I want to encourage everyone to participate in the restructuring discussion later this morning and to forward your thoughts to the Joint Policy Board and steering committee.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you, Marjorie. We also decided in the review of our Division III philosophy to make sure that the philosophy completely and accurately represents our feelings about the gender-equity issue. Since we had been through the Gender-Equity Task Force's study last year, we wanted to be sure that our philosophy reflects how we feel about gender equity in Division III.

For the second report, I am pleased to introduce Alice Chandler, president of the State University College at New Paltz, who will present the report of the Division III subcommittee of the Presidents Commission.

Presidents Commission

Alice Chandler (State University College at New Paltz): Good morning, everyone. I am pleased to report on behalf of my colleagues on the Division III Presidents Commission regarding our progress over the last 12 months. The Presidents Commission is comprised of 44 members, 11 of whom come from Division III. You will find a listing of all 44 Commission members in your Official Convention Notice.

Our subcommittee focused on three critical issues during 1993. The first issue was the Division III membership structure. At each meeting, we spent a significant amount of time discussing the differences that exist among Division III members. This diversity usually struck us as a blessing. At times, however, this blessing appeared to be becoming almost unmanageable. At the very least, this diversity appeared to present a significant challenge that must be explored. The subcommittee's concerns in this regard played an important part in the decision of the Joint Policy Board to begin a complete review of the Association's membership structure and to sponsor Proposal No. 13 at this Convention. I urge you to approve that resolution. I also urge you, and in particular the chief executive officers, to participate in the restructuring discussion later this morning and to express any thoughts regarding this issue to your representatives on the Commission.

Our second focus of discussion was gender equity. The subcommittee noted that although athletics aid does not serve as a barrier to the achievement of gender equity in our division, we cannot be so naive as to ignore other aspects of gender equity. Significant gender-equity issues remain in Division III, especially related to facilities, coaching, travel and recruiting. The subcommittee congratulates the

Association's Gender-Equity Task Force for the work it began on our behalf. I urge the delegates to approve Proposals No. 11 and 12. But as the task force emphasized in its report, the adoption of this legislation alone will not meet the challenge that gender equity presents on our respective campuses. Much hard work remains for all of us.

Our third topic of interest was Division III championships. In June, we sent each Division III CEO a survey regarding the proposed establishment of a regional championships format. Approximately 63 percent responded to the survey. Thirty-nine percent of the respondents favored establishing regional championships. Sixty-one percent favored retaining the national championships format. We concluded that the survey results did not support the further development of the regional championships concept at this time. But we noted that the issue is closely related to the pending review of the Association's membership structure. A summary of the results appeared in the October 4 edition of *The NCAA News* and was mailed to each of your campuses in December. That concludes my report.

Mr. Harvey: I would now like to call on Claire Gaudiani, the Division III chair of the Presidents Commission and president of Connecticut College.

Claire L. Gaudiani (Connecticut College): Good morning. I would like to ask that we pause a moment to thank two colleagues who leave the Presidents Commission. President Alice Chandler, who has served with distinction as vice-chair on the Division III subcommittee and who also has served with distinction on the subcommittee on gender equity and on strengthening the role of the CEO. Also, President Jon Strauss leaves us with this meeting. He also has served with distinction as chair of the subcommittee on nominations. I would like to ask you all to join me in thanking them. (Applause)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Harvey: We are now ready to vote on the items listed under the presidential agenda. The first is Proposal No. 12-A. There are two segments to No. 12. They are being considered and voted on independently.

Sports Sponsorship—Emerging Sports For Women

James J. Whalen (Ithaca College): I move Proposal No. 12-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think it is pretty clear what we are trying to do with these emerging sports. I am not going to go into any great detail. I certainly urge that you pass No. 12-A on behalf of the Gender-Equity Task Force, the Council and the Presidents Commission.

[Part A of Proposal No. 12 (page A-10) was adopted by Division III, 233-8, one abstention.]

Mr. Whalen: I move Proposal 12-I.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is sports sponsorship—emerging sports for women. I think the information is clear about why we want to pass this pro-

posal. I believe there will be some discussion, but I personally urge you to adopt this on behalf of the Presidents Commission.

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): The membership of the North Coast Athletic Conference strongly supports the concept of emerging sports for women. However, we feel this legislation, which was probably written for Division I and then utilized for Divisions II and III, becomes seriously flawed when discussing the ability to utilize two emerging sports for four of the minimum sports required for women.

To allow a Division III member to utilize two emerging sports for two of the four basic women's sports does not really add two opportunities for women. It reduces them. It could be utilized by some members to avoid a real commitment to Division III women student-athletes. We therefore support the concept of emerging sports, but believe the legislation is inappropriate for use as 50 percent of the minimum required Division III sports.

We move to refer this proposal to the Gender-Equity Task Force or the NCAA Council for revision along the lines of Proposal 12-I, as our friends in Division II have proposed.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Note: Voting was suspended to allow for repair of the wireless voting unit.]

DISCUSSION

Restructuring

Mr. Harvey: I would like to say a few words about restructuring. The item is called the ongoing study regarding the NCAA membership structure. I definitely believe this is a timely topic to have at this Convention because the Joint Policy Board has recently issued an invitation to all NCAA institutions, conferences and others to submit ideas regarding possible restructuring of the NCAA. Let me quote from the letter that was sent December 22 to all institutional CEOs: "Those submitting ideas can include the issues or problems to be addressed and are encouraged to suggest a model or models to address them. They can submit models dealing with the overall structure of the Association or with that of a specific division."

A number of factors prompted this call by the Joint Policy Board. Some of these have arisen in the past several months to a year. Others have been with us for several years. Divisional restructuring has been a topic of discussion in past years and at past Conventions from time to time.

We have asked three individuals to comment on the general topic and to initiate discussion. I hope this will be a real active discussion. I think a lot of people feel that this is a topic we must address. It is our responsibility to be active participants in this dialogue. We may well have models and ideas that accurately reflect the needs not only of this division, but of all divisions.

To lead off this discussion, I asked our new executive director,

Cedric Dempsey, to provide us with a broad framework on restructuring and how it has become a primary endeavor of the coming year. As you heard him mention in his speech yesterday, restructuring is at the forefront. As most of you know, Ced began his athletics career as a Division III athlete at Albion College. He later coached and taught there. He knows Division III. He and I have talked a lot about Division III issues, our philosophy and concerns. I feel very good about the NCAA's understanding of Division III's importance with Ced Dempsey as our chief executive.

I would like to introduce Ced Dempsey, our new executive director. (Applause)

Cedric W. Dempsey (NCAA): Thank you, John. It seems appropriate that my first business meeting as executive director would be with Division III. As John indicated, my philosophical base really comes out of this division. I spent 10 years at Albion as an athlete, as a coach, as a teacher and as dean of men. I frequently have been criticized in Division I as being too philosophical as to what athletics should represent, but that is because I grew up at an institution that is part of this division. So it is appropriate that my very first division session would be with this group.

John and I have talked regarding restructuring. My comments will be brief. I want to listen to the discussion. I will be happy to participate in the discussion if you so desire.

I do not see restructuring as particularly a Division I problem in itself. Many of you may look upon that as the case. That is where the media spends its attention and looks at problems in Division I-A. It is a broad problem. It is a problem of looking at whether we have the best structure to meet the commonality of institutions within each division.

I frequently hear individuals within this division say: "We have institutions of less than 500 up to 35,000 students." Is that the best structure for this division?

I also urge you to be proactive. To wait and respond to what another division might propose might not be in your best interests. One of my fears at this point—the only model that has been put on the table at this stage, some of you possibly have seen at least excerpts of it—has come from the Collegiate Commissioners Association. That is an extreme model. We should look at it, but at the same time it could have serious impact on all divisions. It would appear to me that you would not want to just respond to what is already on the table. You should have your input into what the problems are in governance and how do we across the board deal with the multiplicity of institutions within this Association. I encourage you to be proactive in whatever way you think is the most effective for your input.

I also sense in my sessions with the Presidents Commission that they feel it is time to move away from micromanagement and move to maintaining control of the philosophy of intercollegiate athletics within this Association as well as developing a system that allows

more ownership and involvement of people who are in the day-to-day trenches of running intercollegiate athletics and proactive legislation from coaches, athletics directors and faculty athletic representatives that they can respond to. We need to try to improve that part of our governance structure.

So we have a challenge in front of us. It is one of the most exciting challenges that the Association has faced. From time to time, we have tried to patchwork the direction of this Association. Over the years, we have attempted and have been reasonably successful in meeting the needs of different institutions and divisions within this Association. But it is time to take another look at whether there is a better paradigm.

It appears to me that one of the problems is the Presidents Commission added another layer of bureaucracy to the governance structure. We did not change anything below that group. Is there a better way to do that?

Those are some of the challenges we are dealing with. So do not sit back. Don't wait for other people to present models. My concern at the Division I level is people are just reacting to what the Collegiate Commissioners Association has already proposed. That is the problem in developing new paradigms. We want to react to what is already there. Throw away any thoughts of the present structure. Let's look to see whether there is a different approach to managing this complexity of intercollegiate athletics. If we can't find one, then at least we will feel comfortable in knowing that our present structure is still the best way to meet the needs of individual institutions. So please keep that in mind in your deliberations.

John indicated that many of you wonder why we are talking about restructuring. There is no question that Division I-A is very concerned about its role and its inability to function with a commonality of institutions. But trying to find that commonality is very difficult. Let me just throw one concept out to you as we look at a new paradigm. The Division I level is moving toward a feeling that aid based on financial need is one of the courses that we ought to consider. There are going to be some institutions in Division I that will say absolutely not. There are going to be some out for survival. I could name many schools in this country where the athletics program is trying to survive. They may find that their only solution to maintain intercollegiate athletics is to provide aid based upon need. That would impact this division significantly. You need to think about that. What if Division I comes out with a model that includes aid based on need?

Many people feel that Division III becomes a dumping ground at that stage. It is important that you have some insights into how any kind of change in structure would affect the commonality or lack thereof of this division.

So my emphasis with you this morning would be to be open about it. Be proactive. Open up your discussions so that you totally under-

stand that whatever happens in the other divisions can impact, and has impacted in the past, this division.

In many ways, this division has more complexity of structure than Division I in terms of commonality. You have had to deal with many of those complexities. This is an excellent opportunity for us not to look strictly at Division I, but to look at the entire organization and be willing to look at change.

I do know this. I have been around long enough to know that change creates apprehension, concern and anxieties among people. Hopefully, we can move beyond that to where we feel that we can come up with a structure that best represents intercollegiate athletics and the opportunities for student-athletes.

I am excited to start with Division III as my first session. I wish you well in your endeavors and deliberations. But do not pass over this topic lightly. It has an important impact upon your future direction as well as the entire Association. Thank you for your attention. I will stay around and listen to some of the comments. (Applause)

Mr. Harvey: We have also asked members of the Presidents Commission to give their views on restructuring. Claire Gaudiani, our chair of the Division III Presidents Commission, is going to initiate that. Mike Adams is going to participate too.

Claire L. Gaudiani (Connecticut College): In the last year, the subcommittee of presidents in Division III has spent a good deal of time talking through the problems we face in Division III.

We came to three conclusions that I wanted to share with you before asking Mike Adams to frame up some of those issues that we have been discussing. The first conclusion we have come to is that Division III needs a consultant. Someone on par with Wil Bailey and Asa Green. Someone who can be a continuing influence in the NCAA and this restructuring process and assist us in thinking through the complexities of change. We are in the process of preparing a request to the NCAA to get a person who can serve in that capacity. I would like to ask each of you to think about a person who has the kind of breadth and historical perspective about the NCAA so that we can get nominees for this request and then bring a person on board relatively quickly.

The second thing we promised ourselves is that since the Joint Policy Board is looking at how to appoint a committee to deal with restructuring, we want to be positively sure that Division III gets sufficient high-quality representation on that restructuring committee.

Finally, we decided at our April Presidents Commission meeting that Division III presidents should invite the individuals who have brought restructuring plans forward to talk to us so that we can ask questions as those plans are being discussed to really grasp their significance for Division III.

With those three decisions having been made and shared with you, I would be happy to hear your suggestions for ways to move forward and be proactive partners in the restructuring effort.

Now I would like to ask President Adams of Centre College to share with you some of the issues around restructuring, particularly for Division III.

Michael F. Adams (Centre College): Thank you, Claire. When I look at the range of things I have seen in the NCAA over the last 19 years, I don't know of any issue that is going to impact Division III more than restructuring.

Ced, we are fortunate to be facing this issue when we have someone in your chair who has been where many of us are today and who understands the Division III philosophy.

We could talk long and loud about these issues. I don't intend to, but there is a question of growth and success. There is a question of philosophy. There is a question of procedure. All three of those questions will have to be answered for us to be successful.

First of all, we have to acknowledge that many of the problems that we are facing in Division III are a result of the success we have enjoyed over the past five years. Many of you in the room have been approved for NCAA membership after coming out of the NAIA into Division III in recent years.

At the same time, what many of us are calling the domino effect—some of us hark back to Vietnam days and the southeast Asia theory—may or may not prove to be true. As Ced earlier said, there naturally will be more stratification in Division I. In my opinion, there will unquestionably be spill-over, much of which will go to Division III. We are the largest NCAA division. We are the smallest division in the area of dollar impact. Those two in and of themselves are sometimes contradictory. So there is a question of how large we ought to be.

There are issues of public and private schools. There are issues of size. There are issues of conference affiliation. There are issues of national championships. All of these have to be examined sensibly over the next two years.

Secondly, there is a question of philosophy. That is the one on which I would like to count on, but it is becoming increasingly difficult to do so. There are only two requirements to be a member of Division III—you can't give athletically related aid and you must offer a minimum of four men's and women's sports.

One could hypothesize that a school today could offer if the emerging sports proposal were to pass archery, bowling, cross country and golf for women and declare itself an acceptable Division III school under the rules. In my view, that is totally outside of the philosophical stance for Division III, which was originally created to build a broad-based sports program for men and women that would allow as many student-athletes to participate as might have that desire.

National championships in Division III have become more competitive. I know there are many coaches in the room this morning. Coaches are by nature competitive. I was an athlete in college and have coached in college. We all want to win. Bending rules is increas-

ing in Division III. Our philosophy is no longer enough to sustain us. I am sure that there is no one in the room who has ever paid special attention to a young man who could throw the football better than another. But those sorts of questions and observations regarding admissions go on in Division III. You know that as well as I do.

Third and finally, procedurally, how do we get to where we want to be? I think you would agree with me that the type of student you admit probably has more to do with what your institution is like than anything else. The same is true of membership in Division III. The type of school and the philosophical commitment to the true student-athlete concept that ultimately develops will probably determine how this all shakes out as far as our membership is concerned.

The three steps that Claire has outlined are very important. Ced, we do think that we need a consultant at the table while these discussions are going on. The Presidents Commission voted for that yesterday. We want one of our Division III President Commission members at the table when the discussions that ultimately make a difference take place. Finally, we want to hear from you. We are going to invite Dennis Collins, Richard Rasmussen, Steve Argo and others who have expressed both a precise and a broad-based interest in how all of this might shake out. At our April meeting of the Presidents Commission, we will invite several of you who send proposals to us to hear what your ideas might be. If you have a particular restructuring notion that you think would be helpful, send it to the NCAA. Send it to John. Send it to Claire or to myself. We will copy Ced on anything that comes in and vice-versa. We want several colleagues to come to the April meeting to help us work through this on behalf of Division III.

I will just close by saying that while I think gender equity is important, cost cutting is important, ethics, which will be the theme of the Convention next year, is very important, I don't know of anything that will ultimately strike at the heart of what Division III is about as much as this restructuring notion. Who we are, what we are, what type of division we want to be under whatever nomenclature is exceedingly important insofar as the future goes. The current structure was put in place 20 years ago. Think of all the changes that have gone on in American higher education as well as athletics over the last 20 years. It is truly baffling. So we are asking you to give us your best thoughts. I know we are not going to solve that one this morning in the little time that we have allotted. We want to work with you to come up with a suitable plan. I am confident with the help of Ced, the Commission and other members of all three divisions that we can come to a conclusion that you feel good about. (Applause)

Mr. Harvey: Thank you, President Gaudiani and President Adams. It is very encouraging to feel the strong involvement of knowledgeable presidents in affairs of such magnitude. I felt very good about our meetings with the Presidents Commission. They are

inquiring people. They are asking for good information and our opinions. It makes me feel good that we are on a cooperative route.

Before we open the floor for discussion, Dennis Collins, a member of the steering committee, will follow-up his previous work on membership. You will remember his report last year to this business session. Dennis will follow-up with some final comments on restructuring.

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): Thanks, John. Some of the things I had prepared have been covered, but I can add a few things before we start our discussion.

Restructuring is not really a new topic to Division III and the rest of the membership. It has been with us for the last 20 years. The NCAA staff prepared a list of proposals over the last 20 years that have been submitted to this Convention for consideration. I think there were nearly 100 proposals, which shows some unhappiness with the way competitive divisions were set up.

So it has been there for a while. It has not been a great unhappiness, but I think two factors very recently made this issue very different and compelling. The addition of NAIA members who have come into Divisions II and III recently with very different philosophies has made a difference. The economic climate has NCAA members in Divisions II, I-AA and I-AAA evaluating a nonscholarship model for one or even all of their sports. That is a very big factor in what the membership is evaluating and could ultimately be the big factor in how restructuring goes.

Many Division III schools are reevaluating their programs and commitments. The steering committee has talked about the difficulty some schools that have very broad-based programs have in maintaining all of their programs. This is a very difficult issue. I think all of us are reevaluating our commitment to what we are doing. We have to. It is just the times we live in. By working with the other divisions and people in the NCAA, we can consider a new structure or several structures that could establish commonalities. I really like that word. Ced Dempsey met with us in October at our steering committee meeting and used that phrase. He said: "Any new competitive division that should be thought of, you ought to think about commonalities." I thought that was a great concept. Our steering committee is thinking that way now. I think you need commonalities in a championship division.

What could commonalities mean specifically? I think philosophy is important. Maybe we should take that philosophy and make them into standards. I think Division III has no standards. The other divisions in the NCAA have numerous standards. Division I is loaded with them. It has academic and budgets standards and minimum scholarship standards. We have none of that.

Maybe one of the possibilities would be to establish our philosophy and put into standards what our philosophy is for our competitive division. We should look for flexibility in national championships that

could define different competitive levels among Division III or even among members of other divisions. We may want to look at that. Those are concepts I have heard. Some of these are not new. They have been out there for a long time. But it is time to reexamine them. There now is a compelling reason to go forward.

One thing I would add. The Joint Policy Board met with Division III commissioners yesterday. We were very interested in this topic, but we did bring up a point about getting the notice from the Joint Policy Board in late December. Many of our conference winter meetings were over. A lot of us will not have conference meetings until probably next May or March. So I ask that the Joint Policy Board consider extending its deadline to after the conference meetings in May so we could have a chance to really think about this significant issue in our Association.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you, Dennis. I am sure Ced will record that request for an extended deadline. The March deadline has been outlined in the letter.

I encourage you to feel free to openly discuss your views, do some brainstorming or ask some questions.

Kenneth J. Weller (Central College, Iowa): I would like to make an observation about the political circumstances in which we find ourselves in the Association.

I think it is extremely important that we do not say we have a problem, much as Division I does, but that we say there is a problem for the Association that is the same for Division I and the same for Division II. Let me run through quickly the way this thing fits together. The problem is the same. There is an extraordinary degree of diversity within Division I. That same diversity is our problem in Division III. If you look at the dynamics of how this occurred, they are similar. The dynamics of the Division I problem is the enticement that is there for those who get involved in the basketball tournament. It is a very, very tantalizing opportunity. The problem in our case is also an economic cause. There are people looking for opportunities to win national championships.

So what you have is kind of a bipolar change in our Association. People tend to want to get to the top for the basketball money. People try to get chances to win some championships at relatively low cost.

What you have in Divisions I and I-A is a philosophy of sport that involves broad programs and a clear emphasis upon the spectators as opposed to the players. In our case, we have a very clear philosophy. There are people within our division who are less familiar with it. In a sense, Division I and Division III find ourselves as strange bedfellows. In Division I, we have people who don't want to play football and have an absolute minimum of programs. We have the same situation in our case in which they want to be involved in Division III, but haven't adopted Division III philosophy.

The solution is to find commonality. That is what we have to try to do. That is what they need to do and that is what we need to do. A

month or so ago, I made a point of going back to the history of establishing our philosophy. It is significant to note that at the time this was done, there was an enormous amount of interest on the part of the membership in writing this philosophy. We had three national meetings of presidents to read the document and make changes. It was published in The NCAA News. It was a very active process. I suspect many people in Division III aren't familiar with that philosophy. There are many seeking to come into our division who don't have much interest in it. In fact, if you get down to our situation today, there are many institutions here who really want to live up to kind of a slavish following of the legal requirements. We are going to be legal to be in Division III, but we really don't buy that whole philosophical concept. We really want to have programs similar to programs in Divisions I and II, but at a lower cost and a different kind of arrangement.

I believe that there are very real possibilities for redividing and finding these two broad groups that are easy to conceptualize. There are opportunities for these two groups to find a far better situation for themselves within a restructuring process. But it is extremely important that we don't get shuffled off to the side as if Division III has got a few problems too. We have the same problems. The Association has the problem of a lack of commonality. We have to work at it. If we are vigilant and proactive, we can come out a lot better than we are today.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): I would like to make a comment to the presidents. You said you were looking for a consultant. I offer the name of Judy Sweet, who is a past president of the NCAA, a member of Division III and is the best consultant you could find. (Applause)

John A. DiBiaggio (Tufts University): I had the privilege of serving as president of two Division I universities before becoming the president of a Division III university. There is a significant difference between those institutions.

One of the refreshing things about attending a meeting of Division III is that we consider so few resolutions at the presidential level. I think one of the serious problems in the NCAA is we keep passing rules and procedures. As a member of the Knight Commission, we noted that the Manual for the NCAA had grown from 99 pages in 1969 to 399 pages by 1990. Yet, the problems still existed. So the issue is not passing more rules and regulations. Someone commented briefly in the introductory comments that we have to follow Division I and establish more standards. Quite frankly, the more rules we pass, the more we find those who find ways of circumventing those rules. So that is not the issue.

The issue is institutional integrity. Division III has exhibited institutional integrity in great part. If we could simply get the other institutions to do exactly that. We should speak to that issue rather than compromising and passing more rules and regulations to control the

behavior of institutions that are already behaving appropriately. Rather than that, perhaps we ought to get those few who are violators under control through reorganization and structure and then get on with the business of conducting our affairs as we know we should in this division.

Connee Zotos (Hobart and William Smith Colleges): The proposal for restructuring may be a little bit premature. The motives for restructuring are good. If we were a very self-serving group and were interested in protecting Division III, we would go forth on restructuring. The motives at the Division I and perhaps Division II levels are not the same. Some of their motives are to somehow take the rationality of Division III and put it aside. With major issues like gender equity and cost cutting, they want to separate themselves so those decisions can be made from a different philosophical base than the ones that the Division III philosophy may subscribe to.

The NCAA is in a position to strengthen its philosophical base about those major issues. To separate us from it would be a detriment to Division I and Division II athletics in the future. It would have a dramatic effect on sport participation and higher education in general. I propose that we deal with those issues first. Let the NCAA take a position on those issues first and then take a look at restructuring.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): I am hearing a number of negative comments about restructuring. I would like to look at this from a different perspective so that we don't catch ourselves off guard.

I hear words like problem, concern and difficulty. If we approached this from a different perspective and looked at it in more positive terms, I see this as a great opportunity to become greater than what we are. There is a tremendous potential involved with the idea of restructuring if we are willing to look at it from that perspective. It has been a while since we defined why we exist as a division and what our mission is.

It is an exciting challenge. Any time there is the potential for change, there should also exist an exciting challenge. We need to promote ourselves and what we stand for. If we approach it from that perspective, we might be able to come up with some great ideas that take us in a better direction. I would like to use a great quote: "We have nothing to fear, but fear itself." There are some opportunities here. As a division, we need to take it from that perspective.

We need to be proactive. Let's not sit on our hands and wait to see what happens. Let's make it happen. If we take that approach, we won't find ourselves just following the status quo.

Jenepher P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): I suggest that the steering committee do something that would really help us, perhaps in conjunction with the Presidents Commission.

One of the difficulties surrounding any type of problem that we discuss in the NCAA is that it is not just Division III. This particular

issue is driven not by Division III, but by Division I. I think we all know that. That is not to say we don't have problems. But one of the difficulties is knowing what all of those problems are. For any one conference or individual to come up with a wonderful grand plan is a little bit of pie in the sky. It would be helpful if the steering committee, in conjunction with the Presidents Commission, would outline the specific problems and present them to the membership. Then the next step is to look at the goals and the mission and perhaps revisit the philosophy statement and proceed from that point. We are operating in a vacuum. I would make those suggestions.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you very much, Jen. I will respond in a couple of ways. As you heard from Marjorie Giles' report, the steering committee decided at our last meeting to restudy the philosophical foundations that underlie any study of restructuring.

That is one effort the steering committee is making. You heard some indications from the Commission that there are strategies underfoot to begin a study. Your suggestions indicate that we could carry that study further in order to begin the study on a much more informed basis.

Claire L. Gaudiani (Connecticut College): That discussion was very helpful. We will get with Ced to see about postponing the deadline until after conferences have met at the end of this semester.

I couldn't agree more with our colleagues who have focused on the fact that we are driven by a philosophy and a sense of integrity and ethics relating to academics and athletics and that that has to continue to drive what we do in restructuring. I also agree that we ought to continue to promote the Division III philosophy nationally. You all understand how difficult it is to get the national media to pay attention to Division III athletics unless we have an incident, violence, unhappiness or some kind of a crisis. If you are doing things well, it is hard to get media attention. But that just means we have to try harder. That suggestion tells me we have to redouble our efforts to put Division III philosophy before the American public and to continue to try to draw our colleagues in Division II and Division I to the kind of ethics that we strive to mind in Division III.

It is a good idea for us to outline the challenges and opportunities in front of Division III. We will try to develop a way to do that and to get that outline to you so that you can improve your draft and get your ideas back to us so we are all working on the same challenge. We have to be clear that when we talk about restructuring, we are not talking about restructuring Division III. We are talking about restructuring the NCAA.

Many of us want to be sure that the mind of Division III is applied to restructuring the NCAA. We don't want to wait for models from other divisions and then try to figure out how we will take the least abuse. If we assign ourselves that task, then this is the moment for us to think about how all of the divisions could be restructured to maximize opportunities for student-athletes and to continue to strengthen collegiate athletics.

I appreciate the opportunity to talk to you about this. I look forward to your wisdom as we move forward.

Laurie Priest (Mount Holyoke College): President Gaudiani, I support what you said. I look at change as being very positive as well. I have been very frustrated by the fact that Division III is driven by what is happening in Division I. I feel as though we are being dragged along on coattails.

We have been known as the conscience of the NCAA. I am frustrated by the fact that although our numbers are greater than the other divisions, we are underrepresented throughout the NCAA. I am glad to hear that you are going to be like a dog with a bone in going after the Joint Policy Board to make sure we get full representation. Whatever structure we take, we need to have a better representation of Division III on committees throughout the new organization so we can encourage and promote more of an educational model.

Mr. Harvey: We are recording those requests and suggestions. Are there other people who would like to comment? Thank you very much for your active participation. It's time for a break, as prescribed in President Crowley's remarks yesterday.

[The meeting was recessed for 10 minutes.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Sports Sponsorship—Emerging Sports For Women

Mr. Harvey: We will resume at the point at which we left off—the vote to refer Proposal 12-I to the Council.

[The motion to refer Part I of Proposal No. 12 (page A-10) to the Council was approved by Division III, 202-66, three abstentions.]

Official Visit—Meals

Jenepher P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): On behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

The special committee to review financial conditions noted that some institutions seek to impress prospective student-athletes with off-campus meals. The proposal reads that those meals should be provided by dining facilities on the campus. I urge your adoption of this motion. There is an interpretation that defines facilities covered by this proposal.

[Proposal No. 39 (page A-69) was adopted by Division III, 266-9.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Basketball Practice

David A. Jacobs (Whittier College): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

Two years ago, when the change was made in the men's and women's basketball starting date from October 15 to November 1,

many of us realized that we cut a significant amount of practice time—from a possible 32 practice days to 17.

During the past two seasons, with the shifting calendar, we have a constant date of November 1 and a sliding date to start the season on the Friday before Thanksgiving. That gives us a range of practice days, counting the day off each week, from 18 as a high to 14 as a low. It declined from 17, 16 and so forth over the intervening years. We thought it would be better to try to get some consistency by linking those two starting dates and trying to count back to the fourth Monday from the first contest date so that we have a consistent 21 opportunities for men's and women's basketball in Division III.

This has a lot of advantages. Coaches will have adequate preparation time for the men's and women's programs. We feel Division III is unique in that most of us have extensive tryout time that eats away at preseason time and makes for very quick and difficult squad selections that the other two divisions don't have with the scholarship athlete. They pretty much have their team selected. So we feel unique in that regard.

Using the fourth Monday back gives 21 consistent days and an opportunity to plan the practice season. In addition, as you will see in Part B, to make sure that this is not perceived as an increase in practice time, this proposal also cuts the present October 1 team conditioning legislation. We are proposing a cut to October 15, which actually takes away two weeks of contact time between basketball coaches and players.

For these reasons, we feel that this is a proposal that benefits Division III men's and women's basketball players and coaches. I urge your support of Proposal No. 49.

Robert J. Bruce (Widener University): On behalf of my Division III colleagues, I would like to encourage you to support Proposal 49.

The legislation represents a modest adjustment in the preseason practice date for basketball. The offset on the conditioning part of the program makes good sense. We believe it is possible for us to fine-tune legislation in the best interests of the student-athlete without moving against the spirit of the reform movement. We encourage support of Proposal 49.

Lawrence R. Schiner (Jersey City State College): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I want to express support for this proposal.

Because of current preseason and practice-date limitations, student-athletes are being worked longer with much more intensity during this period. This leads to an increased likelihood of injury. Academic performance also suffers because of physical fatigue and increased psychological stress. This legislation gives basketball squads additional on-court practice time necessary to prepare better for competition as well as accommodate the nonrecruited student-athlete evaluation process that is so fundamental to the Division III philosophy.

In return, teams will give up two weeks of preseason conditioning activities. This is a realistic trade-off that will not undermine the reform movement. We urge you to support Proposal No. 49.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): I wonder if someone could give me some dates? When they talk about going to this Monday here, I would like to have some dates for three or four years. You are going to pick up a few extra dates depending on the calendar.

I am not for this legislation. We tried November 1. We have only been in our second year. I would like to see us stay with that for a while before we make another change. I don't care what Division I and II do. We talked about that before. We are Division III.

We have some coaches who coach not only in the fall, but they may coach in the winter. I thought November 1 was working well. Some of our coaches feel they were at a disadvantage because they want to compete against a Division II or Division I team. If someone could give me some dates, I would like to hear some dates.

Mr. Jacobs: We have some dates, Paul. In 1994, October 24 is the start. In 1995, it's October 23, which is the earliest it can go. Then the calendar shifts back. In 1996, it is October 28.

The dates will go back and forth, but the starting date of contests will stay the same. The time period will be the same—21 practice dates. The conditioning will be a very short team-conditioning time. But that will be consistent, if this is passed, to October 15.

James E. Nelson (Suffolk University): I take exception with my New England colleague, Paul Bogan, that November 1 is working well. As one who wears the dual hat of athletics director and men's varsity basketball coach, over the past two years I have found a situation of rushing judgment on individuals who are trying out for the team. Philosophically in Division III, it is necessary and important that all individuals have a worthy opportunity to demonstrate what their skills are. I had to indicate to several young men that the opportunity is not there for them that may have been there if they had had a longer opportunity to show what their skill level would be. I feel frustrated by that.

We are a long way from October 15, which was our original start date that many would like to return to. This appears to be a workable compromise. Our Presidents Commission has seen fit to back us on that. I would certainly support voting in the affirmative in this situation.

[Part B of Proposal No. 49 (page A-85) was adopted by Division III, 217-58, one abstention.]

Contest Limitations—Division III Baseball

John F. Sirianni (Simpson College): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

The philosophy of Division III is participation in many different activities. Many of our athletes in the Iowa Conference play both

baseball and football as well as other fall sports. Therefore, our conference chooses to not have competition in the fall. We are requesting that each institution have the flexibility to schedule their 45-game limit to best serve their school's total program and their philosophy. We are simply requesting a level playing field with our Division III colleagues.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): I urge support of this legislation. It does add flexibility. Many of the Northern schools go south during vacation periods through funds raised by the student-athletes themselves. Classes are not in session. There is no additional missed time. They would have the ability to play additional games rather than return to their campuses and find their fields not ready because of the inclement weather. I urge your support of this legislation.

Alice Chandler (State University College at New Paltz): On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I urge you to defeat this proposal.

To permit an institution to play nine additional baseball contests during the spring is contrary to the reform movement. The current limit of 36 contests during the traditional segment is demanding enough on our student-athletes. Further time demands will be counterproductive.

On behalf of the Commission and the Council, I urge you to vote "no" on Proposal 51.

Edward G. Coll Jr. (Alfred University): The steering committee also urges defeat of this proposal. Permitting an additional baseball contest during the traditional segment would hinder academic achievement and would be a step in the wrong direction. The current playing limits appear to be demanding enough. This legislation would create an unnecessary burden for student-athletes and should be defeated. The Council and the steering committee recommends the defeat of the proposal.

Richard Naylor (Hanover College): Ladies and gentlemen of this distinguished body, this is our second year in the NCAA. We were one of the NAIA schools that you spoke of. Our academic calendar at Hanover is a four-four-one. Right now, we are playing baseball the entire year. This past year, I had a third-string quarterback come to me wanting to quit football because he knew we were playing nine games.

I know you will say, "Well, don't play the nine games. Just play the 36 in the spring." But we have a mid-winter break the first week in March. Then we have a spring break, which is the third week in April. The year before last, we were 41 and 13 and I had seven seniors coming back last year. Spring break occurred in April. We took the week off because we were topped out on games. They went to Florida. Nice suntans and all that kind of stuff. But the continuity of baseball was over.

We are in the Indiana Collegiate Athletic Conference. Our institu-

tion is the oldest institution in the state of Indiana, founded in 1827. Our conference is a very academic, strong conference. You need 1,000 on the SAT to get into our institution. Prelaw, premed, business administration, teacher education, and yes, William Cheers did graduate from Hanover.

It is hard for me when a young man is going to quit. Giving us the flexibility to play the 45 in the spring would really help us. I don't see that this is undermining the reform movement.

Michael Laird (William Penn College): I am asking for your support of Proposal 51. The current limitation of 36 contests during the traditional season is the most restrictive of all sponsored sports when compared to the Division I and II schedules.

A total of 36 is only 64 percent. If our men's and women's basketball teams' schedules were lowered to this same percentage, their maximum schedule would consist of only 17 contests instead of the current 25. Eleven Division III-sponsored sports are at 100 percent with the other divisions' levels. Through creative scheduling, we would be able to accommodate this option without additional cost and missed class time.

In the year that equity appears to be the foremost consideration, we find our current situation with schedule comparison to be quite ironic. The message of this proposal is simply to provide a fair and equitable option in scheduling for all member institutions. Again, I appeal to you for your "yes" vote on Proposal 51.

James Dimick (St. Olaf College): I just returned from the American Baseball Coaches Association meeting. There was overwhelming support on the part of the baseball coaches for the passage of this proposal.

Mr. Laird mentioned the comparison of 64 percent with Division I and II. That same number exists in the NAIA baseball programs and the junior college program. The biggest reason we should be for this proposal is what Dr. Weller talked about a short time ago. The philosophy statement in the NCAA Manual talks about participation and flexibility, not infringing on the rights of institutions to develop programs to fit their own individual needs. To me, that is crucial.

Thirty-six baseball games does not have to be a cost-containment issue. If I am an athletics director and it's an issue, I tell my baseball coach not to play any more. But do I have a right to tell the people in San Diego and in San Antonio to play one game a week in February? That smells of protectionism.

As I wrote in an editorial for Collegiate Baseball, I'm retiring next year, but I'm not voting on all the school bond issues because my children are out of school. I have an obligation to my neighbors' kids. All of us need to see what is best for the student-athlete. That is the key, not the implementation of our own program. Cost containment need not be a factor. Some baseball coaches inform me that it costs more to play those games in the fall than it does in the spring.

Another issue that makes baseball different is that we schedule 36

games and lose six of them to the weather. It is very difficult to reschedule all those games. If you schedule 45 and lose those, you still have easy scheduling.

Loss of class time is another issue. At my highly competitive academic institution, our baseball players do better in the spring than fall. That is the truth. I would submit to you that we ask our baseball players how they would vote on this issue. I urge your support of this.

[Proposal No. 51 (page A-88) was defeated by Division III, 64-191, 13 abstentions.]

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. Harvey: The voting on the Presidential Agenda Day items has now been concluded. We will next proceed to committee reports.

Ethical Behavior

Michelle Tolela Myers (Denison University): I would like to present a report on behalf of the Presidents Commission's advisory committee on ethical behavior in college athletics.

I served on this subcommittee with President Bob Bruce from Widener University, six Commission representatives from Divisions I and II, and three representatives from the coaching communities in the sports of football, men's basketball and women's volleyball. The chair of the subcommittee is President Eamon Kelly of Tulane University.

During the past two years, the Commission has repeatedly expressed concern regarding such issues as fighting, trash talking, profanity, taunting and unruly crowd behavior in intercollegiate athletics. It has issued various statements in this regard and has also identified a broader look at integrity, sportsmanship and ethics in college athletics as a major topic for the Association between now and the 1996 NCAA Convention.

During its September meeting, the Commission agreed to establish the advisory committee to recommend specific short-term actions that might be taken to address concerns regarding sportsmanship and proper conduct in intercollegiate athletics in all sports. At the same time, the Presidents Commission recognizes that it is most effective when it identifies problems and suggests appropriate policies to deal with those problems. Toward that end and based upon the advisory committee's recommendation, the Commission during its meeting yesterday agreed to the following possible solutions. Four of these solutions should occur at the institutional level.

First, university presidents and chancellors should assume the responsibility to ensure that each institution adopts a comprehensive policy and code of ethics governing appropriate conduct by all persons involved in its intercollegiate athletics program, including fans. These policies should be publicized and enforced.

Second, CEOs should hire athletics administrators and coaches who have a philosophy consistent with that policy and code and hold

them responsible for it in the evaluation process.

Third, directors of athletics and other institutional officials, with help from the head coach, should control all aspects of event management of the institution, including crowd behavior.

Fourth, all students involved in athletics activities, including student-athletes, band members, cheerleaders, mascots and fans, should be informed of the acceptable behavior that is expected of them and should be held accountable for that behavior.

Four more solutions should occur within the NCAA structure. First, each sports committee with rules-making responsibility should develop within the playing rules appropriate sanctions for fighting, and these sanctions should be enforced. The sanctions should be equitable across sports as much as possible.

Second, each sports committee with rules-making responsibilities should review all current rules and the need for more stringent rules regarding fighting, taunting, trash talking, profanity and other unacceptable behavior.

Third, the committees will be asked to comment on desirable steps to broaden and increase the application of the Association's existing ethical conduct legislation.

Fourth, the Association's Executive and Communications Committees will be asked to consider developing public information announcements to promote sportsmanship, proper competitive conduct and respect for opponents.

Conferences and appropriate officiating organizations will be asked to participate in all of these efforts. In addition, each coaches association will be asked to submit to the Commission ideas for addressing all of those problems as they relate to the involved sport.

The timetable for feedback from all affected organizations will permit the Commission to review this information during its June meeting. Finally, I want to emphasize that while the Commission supports all of these short-term solutions, it remains committed to the long-term integrity and sportsmanship project that has been identified in its strategic plan as the primary topic between now and the 1996 Convention. Thank you.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you for that report, President Myers. Next, we have a report on the activities of the Special Committee to Study Rules Federation by Sport. We had originally hoped to have the report before our discussion on restructuring because there is some relationship there, but with our other difficulties, we are now coming back to this report.

Rules Federation by Sport

Thomas M. Kinder (Bridgewater College, Virginia): I have the kind of report that most of you want to hear—very short.

As you heard in the opening session, there is a special committee for rules federation. This was formed primarily to look at all the different aspects of the rules. We met October 25 and 26.

You are going to get another survey. I know that you are tired of

receiving surveys, but it is important that you look at that survey when you get home for your input.

The committee will continue reviewing the rationale of recruiting, eligibility, amateurism, playing and practice seasons, and coaching personnel bylaws in an effort to identify problems by sport. We felt that most of the rules are football and basketball generated. The committee wants input into these questions: What if these rules do not apply to a particular sport? Should we look at team sports differently than we look at individual sports? Are there rules that can be eliminated? Are there rules that are Division I driven? What are the major concerns of Division III that can be addressed?

Proposal No. 151, adopted at the 1993 Convention, directed the committee to report to this Convention about the possibility of developing federated rules. These federated rules can be possible legislation for the 1995 Convention. That is where you come in.

It is extremely important to note what John mentioned earlier. There is certainly a connection with rules restructuring. That is going to be a part of the whole picture. You have been asked for ideas concerning restructuring.

I also have an urgent request for you. On your way home, take some of this hotel stationery with you. While you are on the plane, and while some of these things are fresh in your mind, jot down a few of these ideas and drop them in the mail to either John Harvey or myself, Tom Kinder, at Bridgewater College in Virginia. Let us know what you think. Are there rules that are definitely Division III concerns that now apply to all three divisions? Can we give some relief in certain areas, such as the major contact areas that we talked about very briefly at the beginning?

As you heard at the opening session, this committee will meet again in February. We suggest that you get this information to us. If it is sport-by-sport rules or if it is anything that deals with the overall picture of the rules structure, please let us know. Thank you.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

[Note: The slate for Division III representatives to the Council was approved as presented.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Harvey: We still have some time left. I am sure most of you would like to proceed with the remainder of the votes.

Season of Competition

Robert E. Williams (Swarthmore College): I move Proposal No. 63.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the NCAA Council, I urge you to vote in favor of Proposal 63. As the rationale statement of this proposal indicates, exempting preseason scrimmages from counting as a season of competition for two-year college student-athletes will help reduce the

Division III Business Session _____ 199

vulnerability of NCAA institutions in allowing student-athletes who may not be eligible to compete.

Additionally, the committee feels that this proposal is in the best interests of the student-athlete. It protects the student-athlete if he or she received inaccurate information from an unreliable source. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 63 (page A-99) was adopted by Division III.]

Full-Time Enrollment—Correspondence Courses

George M. Harmon (Millsaps College): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 67.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council and as a member of the Academic Requirements Committee, I urge your support of this proposal. It is intended to strengthen the Association's academic standards by precluding the use of correspondence courses for purposes of establishing full-time enrollment.

Correspondence courses are subject to abuse by individuals who wish to major in athletics eligibility and are less conducive to degree completion. Bear in mind that Proposal 67 will not preclude a student from utilizing correspondence courses to satisfy certain requirements for their degree. It simply will require those students who choose to use correspondence courses to establish their minimum full-time program by using hours other than correspondence courses.

[Proposal No. 67 (page A-104) was adopted by Division III.]

Eligibility—Five-Year/10-Semester Rule

Linda S. Moulton (Clark University, Massachusetts): On behalf of the Council and the Eligibility Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal 71.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation allows the Eligibility Committee more flexibility in its authority to grant extensions of eligibility to student-athletes with unusual circumstances.

Before the creation of the Administrative Review Panel, extensions had been granted only when students were unable to attend intercollegiate institutions for documented reasons. Since last year's Convention, the Administrative Review Panel has considered several appeals of what appear to be compelling documented situations that warranted such action, even though the reasons did not meet the current criteria. As a result, the panel recommended and the Eligibility Committee and the Council agreed, that the Eligibility Committee should consider all proposals related to the five-year/10-semester rule and that the provisions of Bylaw 30.6.1 should be modified to provide the Eligibility Committee this broader authority. On behalf of the Council and the Eligibility Committee, I encourage you to adopt this proposal.

[Proposal No. 71 (page A-107) was adopted by Division III.]

Financial Aid—Employment Earnings and Athletics Participation Compensation

Thomas M. Kinder (Bridgewater College, Virginia): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I move the adoption of Proposal 81.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the 1993 Convention, the membership adopted legislation to exempt employment earnings from being included in a student-athlete's individual limits if those employment earnings were obtained after a student-athlete had exhausted his or her eligibility.

The Council and the Financial Aid Committee believe it would be more equitable to permit student-athletes to exempt employment earnings any time after exhausting eligibility, rather than being required to wait until the beginning of the next regular term. This proposal would also permit a student-athlete to exempt any compensation received for athletics participation that occurs after eligibility has been exhausted, such as "barnstorming" tours. I urge your adoption of this legislation.

[Parts A and C of Proposal No. 81 (page A-116) were adopted by Division III.]

Required Day Off During Playing Season

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 93.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal emanated from concerns expressed by the men's basketball committee to the Interpretations Committee that under current legislation, institutions are required to provide student-athletes with one day off per week even while the team is participating in NCAA championship competition. It was the Interpretations Committee's recommendation to eliminate the day-off requirement to accommodate travel and practice requirements necessitated by NCAA championships participation. I urge you to support Proposal No. 93.

[Part B of Proposal No. 93 (page A-129) was adopted by Division III.]

Contest Limitations—Division III Baseball

James M. Malmquist (Gustavus Adolphus College): I move Proposal No. 102.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would establish in Division III baseball the same tournament-date legislation currently in effect for Division III softball.

Joseph Barresi (College of Staten Island): I need a clarification. If we played in City University of New York tournaments, it may be an ECAC tournament and, of course, an NCAA tournament. How do you count those number of games?

Mr. Harvey: The interpretation says that it would not affect conference tournaments under Bylaw 17.2.5.3. It would not affect your conference tournaments.

Joel Tomson (Bard College): Is it possible now that a number of institutions could play two tournament games, but count only one contest?

James Dimick (St. Olaf College): I think it would be up to the administrators in that situation to see if baseball coaches were in compliance. Baseball coaches would run tournaments just as softball coaches run a four-team tournament, a six-team tournament or an eight-team tournament.

In our area, you could do that in the Metrodome, and we could do it on southern trips. This is just softball. This is a gender-equity issue. That is all it is.

[Proposal No. 102 (page A-140) was adopted by Division III, 138-108, 16 abstentions.]

Division III Playing and Practice Seasons

Richard Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal 109.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to balance the needs of institutions with academic calendars that begin fall-semester classes before Labor Day with the need to control preseason costs.

Under the current August 24 starting date, many institutions have little or no opportunity for preseason practice before the start of classes or fall orientation. As a result, many institutions go through their preseason time before the first contest and are not able to practice twice a day while classes are in session. Oftentimes, they must practice at hours that are not conducive to adjusting to an academic environment. This proposal will allow all institutions 16 preseason practice opportunities before their first contest. This does vary from institution to institution depending upon the academic calendar and the date the institution chooses to schedule its first contest.

By way of example, this proposal would add between five and seven days to the preseason period for schools starting classes the week before Labor Day. However, only three to five of those days in any given year would be before the start of classes. For schools that start classes after Labor Day—that would be a Wednesday or Thursday—this proposal generally adds at most five days to the preseason if the institution chooses to play its first contest September 1. If the institution chose to play that game toward the latter half of the week or over the first weekend in September, this proposal might not involve any increase. The preseason starting date could be as early as August 23 or August 24.

The count-back system that is used in this proposal is the same count-back system that is currently used in football. It involves counting six practice opportunities the week of your first intercollegiate contest, and then from that point backwards one practice opportunity for each day classes are in session, and two practice opportunities for each day classes are not in session. You do not count Sundays in determining the number of practice opportunities.

The effect of this proposal will vary from institution to institution and from year to year. This proposal is permissive. It allows institutions to manage their preseasons and their first contest dates within the constraints of their own budgets. It also provides all institutions an equitable amount of time to prepare their student-athletes for the fall season. The sponsors feel that the increased costs associated with this proposal are not excessive and that they are very much an appropriate investment in the well-being of our student-athletes.

[Proposal No. 109 (page A-147) was adopted by Division III, 143-128, three abstentions.]

Division III Playing and Practice Seasons—Traditional and Nontraditional Segment

Marjorie B. Giles (Central College, Iowa): On behalf of the Council and the other sponsors, I move Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the sports of golf and tennis during the fall and schedules more than 50 percent of its contests during that segment to use the preseason practice and first-date-of-competition regulations applicable to the traditional segments in golf and tennis. The proposal will help ensure that participation opportunities for student-athletes in those sports will be less affected by staff shortages, facility limitations and unpredictable weather. I encourage you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 107 (page A-146) was adopted by Division III.]

Division III Playing and Practice Seasons

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal 108.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal permits an institution to participate in an unlimited number of exhibition scrimmages on one date during the preseason practice period in the traditional segment in the sports of cross country, field hockey, soccer and women's volleyball. It is a cost-effective way to prepare teams for the regular season.

Edward G. Coll (Alfred University): On behalf of the steering committee, we wish to express our support for this proposal. The proposal can help institutions cut costs. Institutions can save money by conducting their exhibition scrimmages on one day during the preseason while at the same time helping their teams prepare for the upcoming season.

Moreover, the proposal specifies the institution's limits on contest dates and competition. The steering committee recommends approval of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 108 (page A-146) was adopted by Division III.]

Dates of Competition—Division III

Dolores A. Bogard (State University College at Cortland): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 110.

[The motion was seconded.]

I was not scheduled to do this. I have very little to say about the proposal.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State): In all fairness to the gentleman who proposed this yesterday at the ECAC, I think he was just asking for fairness. You have a nontraditional season and you have to open it up to all sports. So if cross country is considered an individual sport, you have to offer them the nontraditional season, too. That is all I could understand.

[Proposal No. 110 (page A-149) was adopted by Division III, 137-111, 20 abstentions.]

Pregame Housing

Jenepher P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): On behalf of the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics and the NCAA Council, I move Proposal No. 127.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation would disallow housing teams off campus in conjunction with home athletics contests. The special committee saw it as a way to cut costs.

I urge your support. The Council chose not to take a position either in support or opposition to this legislation.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I can understand why Division I is opposing this. If Division III defeats it, it doesn't go into our regulations.

Isn't that a deregulation message we can send? We don't want this legislation in our books. There is just more confusion. Are Division III schools doing this now? Are we taking teams to motels on Friday nights before football games? Are we taking our teams off campus for that kind of housing? If we aren't, we don't need to approve this.

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): As I read this, if you have got football players living in a fraternity house that is having a huge party the night before a football game and you try to make room for them in dormitories, it's a violation because they are not staying in their regular on-campus accommodations. As I read this, that would be a violation. We don't want to head down that path.

Mr. Harvey: The proposal is referring to housing other than regular on- or off-campus housing.

Mr. Harnum: Does that mean the student's on-campus housing or the institution's on-campus housing?

Mr. Harvey: The student's on-campus or off-campus housing.

Mr. Harnum: But if the fraternity is his normal on-campus housing and you ask him to go to a dorm for one night, is that a violation?

Mr. Harvey: Dan feels that he doesn't believe the committee addressed that. He wouldn't want to make an interpretation on that.

[Proposal No. 127 (page A-165) was adopted by Division III.]

Transfer—Hearing Opportunity

Marjorie B. Giles (Central College, Iowa): On behalf of the Council and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I move Proposal No. 133.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal, which would be effective immediately, would require institutions to establish an appeal process for student-athletes if permission to contact institutions about transferring is denied or when the institution will not provide a release pursuant to the one-time transfer exception.

The Council is in support of this proposal because student-athletes often are denied releases to transfer for reasons that are not in the best interests of the student-athlete. Oftentimes, a student-athlete will be denied a release based on the recommendation of coaches, who may decide to grant or deny a release for personal reasons. This proposal would provide the student-athlete a forum for a hearing conducted by an institutional entity or committee outside the athletics department. This hearing opportunity ensures that the best interests of the student-athlete as well as the institution are served.

This proposal is consistent with the trend to advance the welfare of student-athletes. On behalf of the Council and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I encourage you to adopt this proposal.

Richard Kacmarynski (Central College, Iowa/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): As a member of the committee, I urge you to adopt this proposal. It provides due process for the student-athlete.

[Part A of Proposal No. 133 (page A-169) was adopted by Division III.]

Recruiting—Automobile Transportation

Lawrence R. Schiner (Jersey City State College): I move Proposal 141.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council and Recruiting Committee, I urge you to support Proposal No. 141. We believe it is unreasonable to require an institution to count an official visit for each prospect in an automobile even if the institution is not recruiting the other individuals.

For example, if a prospect's brother is a sophomore high-school student-athlete and accompanies the prospect on his visit, the institution could not reimburse the prospect being recruited for his automobile transportation because the current legislation would require the institution to count the brother's visit as an official visit. This proposal would specify that the visit would count as an official visit only for the prospect being recruited.

[Proposal No. 141 (page A-177) was adopted by Division III.]

Recruitment

David A. Jacobs (Whittier College): On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee and the Council, I move Proposal No. 162.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is the first in a series of proposals that reflect the Legislative Review Committee's efforts over the past year to identify ways in which recruiting regulations can be deregulated and simplified.

Specific to this proposal, current legislation related to activities

Division III Business Session _____ 205

that constitute recruitment of a prospect often make it difficult to determine whether a prospect has been recruited.

This proposal will specify an all-inclusive list of three very specific activities that make a prospect a recruited prospect and will eliminate the list of activities that do not constitute recruitment.

We believe this simplifies this area of recruiting regulations and will make it easier for institutions to know whether a prospect has been recruited. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 162 (page A-199) was adopted by Division III.]

Contact with Parents at Site of Competition

Mr. Jacobs: On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee and the Council, I move Proposal No. 165.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal eliminates restrictions on contacting a prospect's parents before a competition. While the prohibition related to contacting a prospect on the day of a competition remains necessary, the Legislative Review Committee believes that it no longer is necessary to prohibit contact with the prospect's parents.

Parents of prospects often seek out coaches at a prospect's competition site. It can be awkward for coaches to have to say that they cannot talk to the parents. Inadvertent violations may result.

The adoption of this proposal also will help institutions maintain compliance in this area. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 165 (page A-205) was adopted by Division III.]

Travel to Official Visit—Reimbursement

Mr. Jacobs: I move Proposal No. 169 on behalf of the Council and Legislative Review Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

Please note that the Convention Program contains a correction for Proposal No. 169. Note that Bylaw 13.6.2.2.1 is not deleted by the legislation.

In recommending this proposal, the Legislative Review Committee believed that it was appropriate to continue the prohibition against an institution's athletics representative providing transportation to a prospect for an official visit. However, the committee concluded that other friends or family members should be permitted to provide transportation for a prospect and to be reimbursed by the institution for the actual mileage incurred at the same rate that the institution allows to its own employees.

It appears that this modification in the current legislation would be reasonable, yet would not open the door to abuse. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 169 (page A-208) was adopted by Division III.]

Publicity

Mr. Jacobs: I move Proposal No. 170 on behalf of the Council and Legislative Review Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

The committee concluded that the extensive restrictions on re-

cruiting publicity were largely a result of concerns about abuses in recruiting in football and basketball.

The committee received observations from some sports coaches associations that those sports were eager for any publicity they could receive. They were not concerned about the use of publicity in manipulating the recruiting process. The committee recommended and the Council agreed to sponsor legislation to delete recruiting publicity regulations in all sports other than football and basketball. I urge your support of this legislation.

Richard Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): On behalf of the University Athletic Association, we would urge that the membership defeat this proposal.

A student-athlete should be treated the same across the board. A basketball player, football player, soccer player or volleyball player should be treated the same. This proposal puts a great deal of pressure on our institutions, particularly our sports information staffs, which are already overworked and overburdened. Getting out the releases in various sports on various individuals puts institutions in a very awkward situation with the students we are recruiting.

[Proposal No. 170 (page A-209) was defeated by Division III.]

Camps and Clinics—Senior Prospect Prohibition

Mr. Jacobs: I move Proposal No. 171 on behalf of the Council and Legislative Review Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

The committee believes that it is no longer necessary to restrict the attendance of senior prospects at sports camps or clinics. By the time camps are conducted, highly recruited prospects have made their commitments to institutions. Those who want a recreational opportunity or a chance to improve their skills in the sport should have the opportunity to do so. This proposal also eliminates the prohibition against employment for those students who are not high-school, prep school or two-year college athletics award winners.

The provision of Bylaw 13.13.1.5 continues in effect to provide protection against recruiting abuses. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 171 (page A-212) was adopted by Division III.]

Camps and Clinics—Employment of High-School Coaches

Mr. Jacobs: I move Proposal No. 173 on behalf of the Council and Legislative Review Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

The committee believes adoption of this legislation would simplify Bylaw 13.13.2.2 in that it would clarify regulations concerning employment of a high-school, prep school or two-year college coach at the camp of a member institution or its athletics department employees.

It imposes the same restrictions for all divisions. Subparagraphs A and B of Bylaw 13.13.2.2.2 set forth two critical tests for such employment. Specifically, coaches must receive compensation at a rate

Division III Business Session _____ 207

that is commensurate with the going rate for camp counselors of like teaching ability and camp experience, and the coach may not be paid on the basis of the value the coach may have for the employer because of the coach's reputation or contact with prospective student-athletes.

The language being deleted did not contain any additional restrictions. I urge your support of this legislation.

[Part A of Proposal No. 173 (page A-214) was adopted by Division III.]

Recruiting—Gifts at Coaches' Clinics

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal 145.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal No. 145 is to prohibit high-school, college prep and two-year college coaches from receiving prizes in conjunction with institutions' coaches' clinics, including prizes donated by outside sponsors.

Much concern has been expressed that under the current rule many institutions are soliciting door prizes from outside sponsors in conjunction with their coaching clinics. Because some of the prizes are of considerable value, the motive behind such prizes may relate to the recruitment of a coaches' prospects and could result in the institution receiving an improper recruiting advantage. The intent of institutional coaching clinics is to provide appropriate instructions to the high-school, prep and two-year college coaches related to the sport and not to be used as a forum for recruitment of prospects. Prohibition against receiving any prizes in conjunction with such clinics will create a move for leveling the playing field and protect against any potential abuse regarding the purpose of such clinics.

I urge you to support Proposal No. 145.

[Proposal No. 145 (page A-180) was adopted by Division III.]

RECONSIDERATION OF VOTING ACTION

Reconsideration of Division III Playing and Practice Seasons

Tony Ladd (Wheaton College, Illinois): I voted on the prevailing side. I move for reconsideration of Proposal No. 109.

[The motion was seconded.]

Susan Petersen-Lubow (U.S. Merchant Marine Academy): I am extremely concerned about the adoption of this proposal. We just voted basketball to at least 21 days of practice. We have just shortened soccer and the other fall sports to only 16 days of practice. I feel we are not going in the right direction with this message. There are probably people who have reasons they would like to see this opposed. I urge those of us who voted "no" to state why it is not a good proposal.

Robert A. Dowd (University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth): I speak in opposition, basically upon the idea of cost containment. If you start classes September 3 and start practice August 19, dormito-

ries would not be available. Housing costs, in addition to the food costs to bring teams back that early would be prohibitive.

Willard Huyck (University of the South): I would like to ask Dick and the advocates of this proposal whether they considered the legal implications of not utilizing all 16 maximum practices before the first contest and whether we are making ourselves vulnerable in that sense to liability concerns.

Mr. Rasmussen: I would like to address that issue and the issue that was raised in the course of the initial motion to reconsider.

First of all, this proposal does not shorten preseason. Institutions that begin classes the week before Labor Day begin classes as early as August 24. The first practice opportunity with their teams is the same day classes start or perhaps the day their freshman orientation begins. As a result, they may only be able to practice once a day from August 24 to their first contest. That is well under 16 practice opportunities. If that is not enough time, they can practice twice a day when classes are in session. We don't feel that that is an academically sound approach to our athletics programs.

This answer also addresses the point Bill raised. We are providing an opportunity for an institution to provide its student-athletes a sufficient number of practice opportunities before its first contest because it is in control of its first contest date. If they do have an early academic calendar, they can give student-athletes the kind of conditioning and instruction they need to avoid and decrease injuries that occur during preseason.

Layton Shoemaker (Messiah College): If I understand this legislation correctly, it is permissive. The group is not required to abide by these regulations in terms of starting at those permissible dates. You can start any time after those dates and set your own institutional starting dates after the permissible dates. You don't have to do this. It is permissive legislation.

John A. Clark (St. Lawrence University): As I understand this, it initially was presented to be an equal playing situation for your first opponent. That is true. But it does not provide for your second opponent who may have the resources to schedule an earlier-than-normal first competition. That team may bring their athletes back weeks ahead of your second meeting.

Ms. Petersen-Lubow: I also urge reconsideration because each one of our institutions is unique.

Not to get into a U.S. Merchant Marine Academy scenario, but we do start school July 20. It was discussed at the ECAC meeting. Proponents of this proposal said schools that did start early could only hold one practice and would be at a disadvantage because of time constraints. I am urging reconsideration of this.

Laurie Priest (Mount Holyoke College): I hate to bring up specific institutional situations, but my concern about this proposal is that it is effective immediately. Due to the Rosh Hashanah holiday, we are not starting class until September 12. We usually start about five

or six days earlier. Our student-athletes will not be permitted to come back before September 4. Unfortunately, our field hockey team and volleyball team play on the 10th. We begin our seasons at that point in time. We are not able to change at this point in time our schedules. If this was to be effective a year down the road, it might be easier to implement. Safety is an important factor. It is too soon to vote this through immediately. I urge defeat of this proposal.

Mr. Rasmussen: I'd like to respond to both of those points, since I was the speaker at the ECAC meeting the other day. You need to look carefully at what the count-back system involves. This system provides each institution with the prerogative to do what is best for its student-athletes. There should be no situation where an institution is going to receive fewer practice opportunities now than they would under the previous situation. If you have a starting date as early as July 20, your first starting date is around September 10. Remember that you count back six days from the week of your first contest. If your first contest were on September 10, you would count back six days, which would put you back at about September 3. From that point backwards you are counting one practice opportunity for each day you are in session and two practice opportunities for every day that you are not in session. You do not count Sundays in that situation. Assuming you are not in class at that point, September 1 would be another two, September 2 would be another two; that would put you at eight. September 1 would put you at 10. August 31 would put you at 12. August 30 would put you at 14. You would get back to about August 26, depending on whether you were crossing a Sunday at that point.

Although you do not count Sundays in determining practice opportunities, you are not prohibited from practicing on that Sunday because you are required to take a day off if you are not in session. You really do have a substantial number of practice opportunities; the same number or better than what you have now.

Patrice A. Milkovich (Oberlin College): This legislation attempts to maximize the competitive-equity issues at our institutions. I urge defeat of reconsideration and call for the question.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 109 (page A-147) was defeated by Division III, 118-149, two abstentions.]

[The Division III business session was recessed at 12:55 p.m.]

Tuesday Morning, January 11, 1994

The meeting was called to order at 8:21 a.m., with Mr. Harvey presiding.

Mr. Harvey: Good morning, and welcome to the second day of our Division III business session.

We will now go to some committee reports. Our first formal item of business is to hear an update regarding the work of the Special Committee to Review Student-Athlete Welfare, Access and Equity.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Special Committee to Review Student-Athlete Welfare, Access and Equity

Linda S. Moulton (Clark University, Massachusetts): The Special Committee to Review Student-Athlete Welfare, Access and Equity was established as a result of the Presidents Commission's call to identify issues related to the experience of student-athletes as a primary topic for the 1995 Convention.

The special committee has 22 members that includes chief executive officers, faculty athletics representatives and athletics administrators from all three divisions. The committee is chaired by Don Behrend, chancellor at the University of Alaska Anchorage. In addition to myself, Division III representatives include Mike Lavelle, president of John Carroll University; Judy Sweet, director of athletics at the University of California, San Diego and Matt Leighninger, a graduate of Haverford College and one of our two student-athlete representatives on the committee. The charge of the committee is broad. It has specific instructions to evaluate the effects that the NCAA's recent reform efforts have had on student-athletes. It also includes a review of the student-athletes' experiences in intercollegiate athletics, a task that the committee has had great difficulty in defining clearly and developing a properly focused course of action. In the first few months, we primarily concentrated on being in touch with enrolled student-athletes. We used a variety of approaches to do that.

There was an informal written survey last spring of about 3,000 student-athletes on the campuses of our various committee members. We had small focus-group interviews conducted by committee members at various locations around the country and meetings with groups of student-athletes from college campuses located in Chicago and Dallas when committee meetings were held in those cities. Those meetings produced a tentative listing of 14 topics for further study. We circulated them this summer to a variety of individuals at each member institution and to NCAA committee chairs and coaches associations for comments.

Since then, the committee also has discussed these topics with the chairs of committees active in the areas identified by the committee and with coaches association representatives, who accepted the committee's invitation to meet in-person.

These various meetings produced an evolution of the original 14 topics into six basic principles that will guide the committee in the development of specific recommendations over the next several months. By April, the committee will be responsible for preparing a report for review by the Council and the Presidents Commission. It is not anticipated that the committee's final recommendations will rely heavily on legislative action by our 1995 Convention when we are scheduled to complete our work.

If you have suggestions or questions, feel free to talk to any of the

Division III representatives on that committee. We would be happy to discuss this further. This report has been very brief in comparison to the amount of work the committee has undertaken. We have found this to be an enormous task. But now that we are focused and dealing with the principles, we'll be able to develop a set of needs that we will present to the Council and Presidents Commission by April. Thank you, John.

Mr. Harvey (Carnegie Mellon University): Thank you, Linda. Next, we will have reports from the Executive Committee and Division III Championships Committee. Mary Barrett is the chair of the championships committee and a member of the Executive Committee. She will give both reports.

Championships Committee

Mary R. Barrett (University of Massachusetts, Boston): Good morning, everyone. The Division III Championships Committee meets three times a year. It is responsible for reviewing recommendations submitted by sports and rules committees that relate to Division III championships administration.

Committee actions are published in The NCAA News after each meeting. I therefore won't take time to summarize each session. I would like to identify committee members for both recognition of their work and so you can identify them if you have concerns. Feel free to address them to any committee member.

Sam Bedrosian, director of athletics, Aurora University; Dan Bridges, director of athletics, California Institute of Technology; John Harvey, director of athletics at Carnegie Mellon, and Bob Williams, director of athletics, Swarthmore College.

John's term is going to be ending. On behalf of the committee and the staff, we would like to thank John for his excellent contributions to the championships committee and to Division III. (Applause)

During the 1992-93 academic year, 7,152 student-athletes competed in 24 Division III championships, compared to 7,219 during the previous year. The percentage of Division III institutions that participated in championships was 66.9 percent. Over \$4 million was spent in transportation and per diem expense. Transportation expense increased more than 18 percent during 1992-93, due primarily to increases in air fares.

The refinement and implementation of changes in the NCAA championships program I reviewed with you at last year's business session were the focus of the committee's work this year. At its May meeting, the Executive Committee and the Division III Championships Committee approved increases in the following championship brackets effective with the 1993-94 championships: women's basketball, from 32 to 40 teams; women's volleyball, from 24 to 32 teams; women's softball, from 20 to 24 teams; women's cross country, from 136 to 184 individuals; women's tennis, from 112 to 124 individuals; and women's outdoor track, from 246 to 315 individuals.

In addition, the concept of a play-in system for Division III was ap-

proved. It will be refined this year at the request of both the men's and women's basketball committees. So this will be coming before the championships and Executive Committees in the May meeting. We have something exciting to look forward to once that is refined.

As you are well aware, we have seen steady growth in our division membership, particularly in the number of institutions sponsoring women's soccer. During its December meeting, the committee discussed the impact of this growth, particularly as it relates to championship brackets. It was agreed that the application of percentage guidelines has resulted in an overall championships program that provides equitable championship opportunities for men and women student-athletes while reflecting the membership's priorities. Accordingly, sports sponsorship numbers and bracket sizes will be evaluated during the December meeting. Any contemplated change in a championship bracket will continue to take place to maintain an equitable number of opportunities for men and women in the overall championships program, the responsible allocation of the Association's financial resources and the ability to efficiently manage and administer the event.

We also reviewed the results of the June 14 survey of Division III chief executive officers regarding the proposed establishment of a regional championships format. For your information, approximately 63 percent of the Division III institutions responded to the survey. Of those, 39 percent of the respondents favored the establishment of regional championships, while 61 percent favored retaining the national championship format. We have taken no action on this, but will continue to monitor this topic.

During the coming year, the committee will review the impact of the changes in the championships program, the possible implementation of a play-in system for men's and women's basketball, and examining possible legislation that would permit Division II institutions in the sports of field hockey, men's ice hockey and men's lacrosse to participate in the respective Division III championship, contingent upon the approval of the membership in those sports. To that end, a survey of Division III institutions sponsoring those sports will be conducted in late January.

Finally, the committee recognizes that restructuring is a major issue for all three divisions that will be discussed later in this session and as we continue our deliberations through the year. The committee believes that it will be important to communicate with Divisions I and II regarding their models and what is being considered for those divisions.

As always, we welcome your suggestions to improve the championship program. We do read the correspondence. We are not getting as much lately as we used to. While we are not able to always implement every specific suggestion, we do refer the correspondence to the appropriate committees. We want to hear from you. We want to make the championship program a model for Division III. Please

don't hesitate to contact me, any member of the committee or Donna Noonan, director of championships, at the NCAA office.

At this time, I would like to take a moment to ask member institutions or representatives who have hosted championships to stand, please. We would like to recognize those people and thank them for their effort. (Applause)

Executive Committee

Ms. Barrett: I would like to briefly give you a report of the Executive Committee. Basically, the entire committee report is in NCAA Annual Reports, which you received when you registered. So I won't really go over too much. Just a couple of significant points.

Among the most significant actions taken by the Executive Committee in 1992 was the approval of a record operating budget in excess of \$185 million for the fiscal year 1993-94, the initiation of a search process to hire the Association's executive director and a comprehensive study of the NCAA championships program.

For 1993-94, NCAA operating revenues were projected in excess of \$173 million, of which 70 percent was distributed to the membership or used to fund the NCAA championships program.

The 1993-94 budget included a \$2 million budget for the drug-testing program, which was a reduction of \$1.4 million from the previous year; \$500,000 to administer an initial-eligibility clearinghouse program; \$100,000 to fund a pilot diversity training workshop program, which was recommended by the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee, and approximately \$500,000 for research.

During the fiscal year 1992, revenues exceeded expenses by approximately \$3.6 million. There was considerable cost savings of about \$1 million at the national office. Unallocated surplus money of approximately \$5.7 million will be transferred to fund the operating reserve. Approximately \$1.2 million was placed in the membership trust, and \$3 million was returned to the membership as a supplemental payment based on the broad-based component of revenue distribution.

Considerable time, travel and concern were spent by your Executive Committee in dealing with the resignation of Richard Schultz, the search process and ultimate hiring of Cedric Dempsey. That was an ongoing process from spring until recently.

In the August meeting, the Executive Committee began a comprehensive study of all phases of the NCAA championship program. Over the next year, two surveys of the membership were conducted to assist the Executive Committee in determining Association priorities relative to the program. Principles that were developed to guide the actions were:

- Men's and women's championships should be treated equally in terms of field size, per diem allowance and official traveling party.
- The championship formats should place emphasis on quality competition for elite teams and student-athletes while providing increased access for conferences.

- The sponsorship level of sports by the membership should be used to determine the treatment of specific championships as well as the continuation of championships and the establishment of new championships.

I would also like to call your attention to the fact that the Executive Committee has sponsored or cosponsored some legislation that is mentioned in your Official Notice. The committee continues to work with the approval of increased sizes in particular committees, which is noted in your Official Notice.

There also was a special subcommittee established to review championship awards. That report was accepted by the Executive Committee. It had as its focus an equity consideration, so we were pleased with the results of that.

Some future concerns that we will be looking at, among the usual types of business, will be a rather innovative concept in terms of NCAA licensing, which is a new frontier. We have continued to look at the NCAA Foundation and its work, and we are going to continue to monitor the catastrophic insurance program. Additional details are contained in NCAA Annual Reports.

WAIVERS

[Note: The Division III business session heard petitions for waivers of Division III membership criteria from Chapman University, Howard Payne University, Milwaukee School of Engineering, St. Joseph College (Connecticut) and Villa Julie College. The petitions were approved.]

RECONSIDERATION OF VOTING ACTIONS

Mr. Harvey: We are at the point in the agenda where we have the opportunity for any reconsideration or any commentary relative to legislation.

Reconsideration of Pregame Housing

David A. Jacobs (Whittier College): Having voted on the prevailing side, I move reconsideration of Proposal No. 127.

[The motion was seconded.]

Yesterday, the discussion was that this was a cost containment issue. It was voted down in Division I-A. It seems appropriate to reconsider this for Division III. We stand alone with this legislation on our books. As one of the speakers noted yesterday, this is an example of reducing legislation that doesn't have any effect on Division III. Let's keep that out of the Manual. I urge your support for reconsideration.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 127 (page A-165) was defeated by Division III.]

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Harvey: We are now at the point when we can discuss other subjects.

Timothy W. Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): I wanted to in-

Division III Business Session _____ 215

form everybody that our parliamentarian, Armin Langholz, is retiring. This will be his last Convention. Armin has been a faculty representative for Capital University for 25 years. He has really served nationally and conference-wide as well. He has done an outstanding job. I think he deserves our salute. (Applause)

Linda S. Moulton (Clark University, Massachusetts): On behalf of the steering committee, and I know that I speak for the entire membership, it seems appropriate that we certainly would recognize your extraordinary leadership as our Division III vice-president for the last two years.

There are many in this room who have not had an opportunity to work with John. But I know that I speak for all of us in terms of someone who is sensitive and thoughtful. He has been a consensus builder. I know of no one who could have provided the insight and the vision at a time when Division III has certainly avowed to approach several challenges.

So I would like to, both as a friend and a colleague, thank John for all that he has done, even though we will have him another year on the Council. Thank you very much. You have done a tremendous job for us. (Applause)

Mr. Harvey: Thank you. I really appreciate that. It is a real pleasure to work not only with the members of the steering committee—that is a real solid group of dedicated people—but also with the whole Division III membership. It always reaffirms my belief in the Division III philosophy when I talk to the individuals involved. Thank you.

I want to thank all of you for your participation in these dealings. Your active interest is really what makes this whole thing run effectively. If we sit back and don't take an interest and don't participate and don't give the pros and cons, we don't get as far ahead.

Two members of our steering committee are completing their four-year term on the Council. Marjorie Giles and Sandy Weeden have been conscientious and hard-working members. This body should properly thank them for a great deal of effort over those four years. (Applause)

The final item is for me to congratulate the vice-president-elect, President Ed Coll of Alfred University. I believe his selection is a significantly good thing for the Division III membership, for our steering committee and for the whole Association at this time. Ed formerly was a member of the Presidents Commission. He has a good background in sports. He is very interested in our dealings. He has been on the Council this past year. We have all come to realize that he knows the game. He knows what is going on here. I think he will be a very, very effective leader for us.

So, my small reluctance to turn over the reins of this office is only small, because I feel that we are turning the reins over to a person who is really going to do the job for us. I would like to hand the gavel to President Ed Coll. (Applause)

Edward G. Coll Jr. (Alfred University): Thank you so much, John. I certainly echo the wonderful comments made on your behalf by Linda. You certainly have done a spectacular job as the vice-president of Division III.

I am also extremely flattered by the expression of confidence that you have placed in me by this election. As you will get to know me, you will see that I am like virtually every other college or university president. I do exactly what I am told. I don't like to stand on formality. I will be very uncomfortable if you refer to me as "President Coll" or "Dr. Coll." I am most comfortable with just "Ed." I intend to address you by your first names as we attempt to establish some camaraderie.

I am looking forward to this. I think it is going to be an exciting time for us, particularly as we go into restructuring and talk about the new and emerging philosophies that should be Division III's battle for the century. So, we should have an exciting two years ahead of us.

I am again pleased to be at your service. I look forward to a very exciting time for all of us. Thank you all so very much.

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 9:24 a.m.]

Division I Business Session

Monday Morning, January 10, 1994

The Division I business session was called to order at 10 a.m., with Division I Vice-President R. Elaine Dreidame, University of Dayton, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Dreidame: We are now officially calling the Division I business session to order.

Our parliamentarian is Alan Chapman, a name that is familiar with anyone who has attended an NCAA Convention during the past 20 years.

Our primary task today is to complete the Presidential Agenda Day portion of the agenda for the Division I business session.

[Note: The procedure for voting was explained.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Sports Sponsorship—Emerging Sports for Women

Phyllis L. Howlett (Big Ten Conference): On behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission, I move Proposal No. 12.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to establish maximum financial aid limits in emerging sports for women and to permit institutions to use those sports to meet the Association's minimum sports sponsorship and financial aid award criteria.

The identification of these emerging sports for women will create more opportunities for female student-athletes to participate in intercollegiate athletics. The emerging sports are hockey, archery, badminton, bowling, crew, ice hockey, squash, swimming, handball and water polo. They may be used by institutions to meet sponsorship criteria.

In addition, such Division I sports may also meet minimum financial aid requirements as well for revenue distribution purposes. The legislation provides flexibility for the Council to periodically identify future emerging sports for women. I urge your support of Proposal No. 12.

[Parts A, B, D and E of Proposal No. 12 (page A-10) were adopted by Division I, 314-10, one abstention.]

Satisfactory Progress—Regular Academic Year

Carl W. Asp (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I move Proposal No. 22.

[The motion was seconded.]

This particular satisfactory-progress proposal calls for a ratio change. Everything remains the same—the 24 hours and the five years—that brings a student-athlete close to 120 hours.

The only thing you are looking at here is the ratio change of one course in the semester system. That amount is 75 percent to 62.5 percent. It gives more opportunity to satisfy satisfactory progress. It helps students who are insecure and need help with their academic career. I urge you to vote for this ratio change.

Eamon Kelly (Tulane University): On behalf of the Commission and the Council, I stand to oppose this amendment.

This proposal is a misguided attempt to water down the significant academic reform proposals that the Division I membership adopted in 1992. That legislation was adopted to emphasize greater academic achievement during the regular academic year and to increase the percentage of summer-school hours. It may be used to establish the student-athlete's continuing eligibility and place greater emphasis on the athlete at the expense of the students. Quite simply, this proposal is contrary to the spirit of academic reform and should be defeated.

Jerry L. Kingston (Arizona State University): I rise in opposition to Proposal No. 22. This proposal would simply set back a portion of the academic reform legislation that was passed in the 1992 Convention.

There is a waiver of authority that has been provided in legislation that permits exceptional cases to be handled by the Academic Requirements Committee. Another argument against this legislation is that we have already heard many comments about the complexity of the satisfactory-progress rule. To be imposing yet another set of percentages for a class for credit terms in 1994 only compounds and makes it more confusing on the satisfactory-progress rule. On behalf of the Council, I strongly urge the delegates to defeat this proposal.

[Proposal No. 22 (page A-37) was defeated by Division I, 24-298.]

Expenses—Travel-Squad Size Limitations

Charles S. Harris (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I move Proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Presidents Commission and Council propose this legislation as sponsored in order to permit Divisions I and II membership the opportunity to consider it. They did not take a position of opposition or support on it. They simply affirmed the opportunity to review and vote on it. This proposal was initially submitted at the 1993 Convention and it is before you again.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (The Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal 23-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Ivy Group has had travel-squad limits for some time as an effective way to control costs and provide competitive equity in our

conference competitions. We do believe that the numbers proposed in our main motion are lower than our other sports, and No. 23-1 provides a slightly higher limit in those sports.

We would note that Proposal 23 applies only to overnight or air travel and, therefore, would provide travel-squad limits for some teams within the conference and not for others, depending upon the flight or travel for a particular contest. The higher numbers in Proposal 23-1 provide more equity within conference competition regardless of the teams involved. We hope that this body supports it.

[Proposal No. 23-1 (page A-39) was adopted by Division I, 169-150, five abstentions.]

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): I move Proposal No. 23-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council sponsored Proposal No. 23-2 because it believes its travel-squad limitation of 13 in basketball is more appropriate than a limit of 12, since the scholarship limitation is 13.

[Proposal No. 23-2 (page A-40) was adopted by Division I, 268-60, one abstention.]

Mr. Orleans: On behalf of the sponsors. I move Proposal No. 23-3.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 23-3 provides an exemption from the travel-squad limits in the main motion for spring-break trips conducted during vacation on the theory that those trips would ordinarily involve the first attempt of many squads, particularly in the North, to get out of doors. It's the first chance for freshmen in those sports to have a chance to practice and compete with the varsity. It involves very little institutional cost, in our experience. We believe it provides good participation opportunity with minimal additional cost and no missed class time. We again ask this body's support.

[Proposal No. 23-3 (page A-40) was adopted by Division I, 208-118, one abstention.]

Mr. Orleans: Is Proposal No. 23-4 moot?

Ms. Dreidame: I understand that it is pointless because of the interpretation. So, in essence, yes.

Mr. Orleans: Thank you. Then, on behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 23-5.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 23-5 proposes two additional travel-squad members under the overnight and air travel provision of the main motion. When an institution has two or more contests scheduled back-to-back on a weekend trip in the sports of baseball, softball, soccer, field hockey and ice hockey, we and many other conferences use this schedule to minimize lost class time and to minimize the number of trips. We believe that this is an effective and cost-effective change. We again seek this body's support.

[Proposal No. 23-5 (page A-41) was adopted by Division I, 193-126, 10 abstentions.]

Roy Kramer (Southeastern Conference): We have listened to great oratory for the past half-hour on 14 different minor and minuscule provisions to add to various sports and to consider various options for various sections of the country.

It is obvious that this is lack of management. This is an issue that we thought we were going to address by some sort of deregulation some years ago. This is a needless piece of legislation that should be addressed by the conferences. They should look at their own geographical limitations, their own problems and set their own travel squads. This should not be managed by the NCAA, but by the conference. I urge your defeat of this measure.

Frederick E. Gruninger (Rutgers University, New Brunswick): I would like to stand and support Mr. Kramer. There is no question that we have spent a lot of time working these numbers. We have done some fine-tuning, but I think the whole overall philosophy should be left to the conferences to make the decision. That is where we best know how to establish our selection and where we stand. I stand and ask your support to defeat No. 23.

[Proposal No. 23 (page A-38) was defeated as amended by 23-1, 23-2, 23-3 and 23-5 by Division I, 133-194, three abstentions.]

Scouting of Opponents—Football and Basketball

James E. Delany (Big Ten Conference): I move Proposal 24-B on behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of Proposal 24-B will eliminate off-campus, in-person scouting of opponents in Division I in men's and women's basketball. This recommendation of the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics was initially submitted by the National Association of Basketball Coaches and was supported by representatives of the Basketball Coaches Association. The coaches feel that scouting opponents should be done through review of game films. In the opinion of the special committee and the Presidents Commission, significant savings can be anticipated by eliminating scouting. In order to assure actual savings, the legislation will also preclude institutions from employing or paying scouting expenses of someone else, including a professional scouting person.

It is also worth noting that this will eliminate an advantage to certain schools. The proposal includes all in-person, off-campus scouting of opponents in Division I basketball and does not permit an individual to scout his or her own family. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Part B of Proposal No. 24 (page A-42) was adopted by Division I, 279-50, two abstentions.]

Restricted-Earnings Coach

Chris Monasch (Northeast Conference): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I move Proposal No. 27.

[The motion was seconded.]

Laurence C. Keating Jr. (Seton Hall University): I would like to move Proposal No. 27-1.

Division I Business Session _____ 221

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 27-1 increases the length of service for restricted-earnings coaches from the proposed three years to five years. A survey of the full-time assistant coaches revealed that it took 5.2 years to move from part-time or an assistant's position to a full-time assistant's position in Division I.

This amendment provides a reasonable period of time for a restricted-earnings coach to move into a full-time position. I urge your support of No. 27-1.

John V. Kasser (University of California, Santa Barbara): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I seek your support of this proposal. Moving the period for a restricted-earnings coach from three to five years is consistent with the results of the National Association of Basketball Coaches survey, and the average of 5.2 years for a part-time coach or a graduate assistant coach to move on to a full-time position. In addition, the Council does not believe that this proposal will not provide the intent of Proposal No. 27. It therefore is supporting this proposal.

Kenneth A. Shaw (Syracuse University): I want to report that the Presidents Commission also supports this resolution for the reasons already stated.

Betty Jaynes (Women's Basketball Coaches Association): The members of the WBCA ask your support of Proposal 27-1. We feel that the coaches should have a maximum of five years in a restricted-earnings position before they advance to a full-time coaching position at another institution. The Division I women's basketball coaches urge your support of this amendment.

[Proposal No. 27-1 (page A-46) was adopted by Division I, 304-24, two abstentions.]

Mr. Monasch: The restricted-earnings coach provision was established in 1991 by a vote of the Division I membership. The purpose behind the establishment of the restricted-earnings coach was to encourage the development of new coaches and to reduce cost in intercollegiate athletics by limiting the amount of compensation provided to the restricted-earnings coach.

Because it appears that the intent of the original legislation to create a restricted-earnings coach is continuously compromised, especially in the sport of basketball, the Council and the Presidents Commission believe it is important to adopt the proposal in order to assure that the restricted-earnings coach truly is an entry-level position. We urge your support.

[Proposal No. 27 (page A-46) was adopted as amended by 27-1 by Division I, 234-91, two abstentions.]

Athletically Related Income

E. Roger Sayers (University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa): I move Proposal No. 28.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal strengthens institutional control. It provides for the

reporting of written approval for outside income for athletics personnel or clerical and secretarial staff. This is a provision that exists for many nonathletics personnel.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina AT&T State University): On behalf of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference, we are in support of Proposal No. 28 in the interest of institutional control.

[Proposal No. 28 (page A-47) was adopted by Division I other than 1-A, 192-21, one abstention.]

Contacts and Evaluations—Division I Football and Basketball

Michael B. McGee (University of South Carolina, Columbia): On behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission, I move Proposal No. 34.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics recommended this legislation to reduce the cost of off-campus recruiting in Division I football and basketball.

With the passage of Proposal No. 33 this morning, football is moot. The proposal reduces the permissible number of evaluations from four to two, and restricts the number of visits to each high school—once per week during the evaluation period. In light of the July evaluation period in basketball, which does not count, it is the special committee's position that the additional evaluations beyond two are generally unnecessary to determine the athletics skill of the prospect. If further evaluation is needed, it can be utilized. Additional evaluation of prospects in matters other than athletics skill can occur by correspondence, telephone or in-person contact days with the prospect. This legislation makes no change in the current limit of three off-campus in-person recruiting contacts with the prospect. The NABC supports this legislation. I urge your support of this cost-reduction legislation.

[Parts B and D of Proposal No. 34 (page A-55) were adopted by Division I, 216-105, seven abstentions.]

Division I Football and Basketball—Recruiting Calendars

James E. Delany (Big Ten Conference): I move Proposal No. 35-A, -B and -C on behalf of the Council and the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Delany: I would like to also move Proposal 35-1 on behalf of the Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council decided to sponsor amendment-to-amendment No. 35-1 to eliminate the designation of "person days" from the recruiting calendar.

The Council decided that that definition problem and the conditional complexities created by the first contact was unnecessary to achieve the objectives in Proposal No. 35. The amendment-to-amendment still limits the number of days coaches are eligible for recruiting prospective student-athletes off campus in the sport of basketball.

ball I urge your support of this amendment to Proposal No. 35.
[Proposal No. 35-1 (page A-63) was adopted by Division I, 290-30, two abstentions.]

Mr. Delany: Proposal No. 35 is the recommendation of the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics. That committee identified the length of the recruiting calendar in Division I football and basketball as a major recruiting cost in those sports.

The committee suggested significant reduction in the number of days allowed for recruiting. After reaction from the coaches association in the involved sport, the committee felt that the recommendations set forth in No. 35 were necessary. These calendars reflect the assistance of coaches associations in identifying the appropriate dates, but are more limited than the coaches desired. Many believe that the recommendation maximizes effective use of the calendar. In basketball, the legislation identifies the extended period of time during which evaluations can take place, but it limits the number of days in that period when the coaches can be off campus. Further, the legislation limits the institution to the prospect's educational institution on the one calendar day during the October early signing period. I urge your support of the legislation.

James Haney (National Association of Basketball Coaches): The National Association of Basketball Coaches supports this proposal.

[Parts A through C of Proposal No. 35 (page A-57) as amended by No. 35-1 were adopted by Division I, 250-71, three abstentions.]

Official Visits—Division I Football and Basketball

Ferdinand A. Geiger (University of Maryland, College Park): I move Proposal No. 38-B and C on behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics identified eight paid initial visits to a member's campus as a costly element of recruitment. Accordingly, the committee recommended and the Council agreed to sponsor legislation to reduce the permissible number of official visits in the sport of basketball from 15 to 12.

It is the committee's view that 12 is still a sufficient number to accommodate the recruiting needs of all Division I members. Part 38-C of this legislation will provide a later opportunity for an institution that has made a head-coaching change after nearly all of the permitted official visits in that sport have been utilized.

I urge the support of the Convention on this legislation.

James Haney (National Association of Basketball Coaches): I rise in support of this motion for cost reduction.

[Parts B and C of Proposal No. 38 (page A-67) were adopted by Division I, 237-90.]

Official Visits—Meals

Michael B. McGee (University of South Carolina, Columbia): On behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission, I move Proposal No. 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics feels this legislation will reduce the high costs of providing prospects with meals at off-campus dining facilities during official visits to an institution's campus.

The committee feels that off-campus meals are inconsistent with the purpose of recruiting visits to show a prospect normal student life on campus. It can result in a recruiting advantage for institutions that provide meals for visiting prospects in off-campus dining facilities.

The special committee recommended and the Council and the Presidents Commission agreed to sponsor legislation to restrict meals during official visits to regular on-campus dining facilities unless all such facilities on campus are closed. Although there was concern about over-regulation, it was decided that off-campus meals are an unnecessary cost and that some institutions may feel obligated to provide them in order to be competitive with other member institutions. This being the case, the legislation is presented for your vote.

Please note that there is an interpretation concerning this legislation included in the material distributed to the Convention. I urge your support of this proposal.

Beverly D. Lewis (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): In discussions of this proposal with the Southeastern Conference student-athlete advisory committee, the students indicated that wherever they attend college is based on the institution's academic program, coaching staff and overall campus environment.

Where they are taken to eat on official visits had very little impact upon their decision regarding where they will spend the next four years of their lives. Moreover, the students agreed that prospects were taken to eat in very modest, reasonable restaurants off campus, and thus believe this regulation is unnecessary. On behalf of the Southeastern Conference student-athlete advisory committee, I urge the defeat of this proposal.

James Haney (National Association of Basketball Coaches): The coaches support this proposal for cost containment.

[Proposal No. 39 (page A-69) was adopted by Division I, 182-141, five abstentions.]

Recruiting Materials

Melissa L. Conboy (University of Notre Dame): On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee, Council and Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 40.

[The motion was seconded.]

This one is in an effort to deregulate and simplify the NCAA Manual. Bylaw 13.4, which defines both permissible and nonpermissible recruiting materials, is arguably one of the most over-regulated and

confusing areas of the Manual, resulting in interpretations by the coordinator, conference contact and NCAA staffers, and even the Interpretations Committee.

Many of these restrictions are pretty material and originated to save money. Many believe that these restrictions have the effect of increasing instead of reducing expenditures. The official interpretations rendered in this area are relatively burdening, including the NCAA Manual. This proposal significantly reduces the list of permissible recruiting materials and eliminates the list of nonpermissible items. Simply stated, if an item does not appear on the permissible list, it may not be given to a prospect. We feel the proposed changes will allow coaches to provide those materials that are most important to a prospect in making a college decision. General correspondence, official academics and admissions materials, free service publications and NCAA educational material may still be provided.

The university newspaper, formerly included in the list, will no longer be permitted to the prospect in a mailbox. I urge you to vote in favor of this proposal.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (The Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors of this proposal, I would like to move Proposal No. 40-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

We don't believe that Proposal 40 as written deregulates or simplifies. It doesn't deregulate, because it prohibits prospects from receiving an entire class of publications. It is not simplified because Part F allows the mailing of general correspondence.

It indeed invites the membership to ask the interpretive bodies to interpret what is general correspondence. That was the very clear message given by NCAA staff to the commissioners meeting when we asked them how general correspondence would be interpreted.

In addition, we believe that the institution should have the opportunity to establish reasonable and cost-effective publications that can indicate the nature of their athletics and academic programs to prospective student-athletes. If particular sports are using them, then we should address those sports and those publications in a very specific manner, rather than in the name of deregulation. This simply deprives students of the opportunity to receive an entire class of information.

Proposal 40-1 will retain a status quo as to the mailing of recruiting brochures and as to the ability of the student-athlete to pick up the game program in their sport when making an official or unofficial visit. It will permit us to believe there are specific abuses that need to be corrected. It will correct these. We ask you to pass 40-1.

James Livengood (University of Arizona): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move to separate Proposal 40-1 and ask that B and E be voted on separately.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The motion to vote separately on Parts B and E of Proposal No. 40-1 was defeated by Division I, 109-178, nine abstentions.]

Betty Jaynes (Women's Basketball Coaches Association): The members of the WBCA are in strong support of providing prospects with media guides, recruiting brochures and game programs. Our coaches believe that these materials provide information to students and our students agree with them.

Our coaches do not have sufficient electronic and media exposure to give students information regarding our institutions. If this information is eliminated, the recruiting process for college women's basketball will be severely handicapped.

We were a positive participant in the financial considerations committee. This is the only area of concern that the WBCA felt was a gender issue. We urge, on behalf of Division I, support of Proposal 40-1.

[Proposal 40-1 (page A-73) was adopted by Division I, 191-127, seven abstentions.]

[Proposal No. 40 (page A-70) was adopted as amended by No. 40-1 by Division I, 277-45, four abstentions.]

Maximum Awards—Division I Men's Basketball

Steven C. Beering (Purdue University): On behalf of the Big Ten Conference and the other sponsors, I move Proposal No. 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is our conviction that you need to repair an inequity that occurred at a previous time and restore equity in our men's and women's basketball scholarship numbers. We believe that there are other ways to save money. I therefore urge the membership to vote for Proposal No. 42.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge that Proposal No. 42 be defeated.

In America today, 70 percent of all Division I programs are in a deficit. Forty-two states have had their budgets cut. This proposal does not equalize men's and women's scholarships in basketball. It only raises the scholarships. It does not tie into anything else. It is vitally important that we not retreat.

The Presidents Commission and Council have commissioned a study to look at the impact scholarship reductions have had on minorities. This study will come back at next year's Convention, which will focus on the issues of access, equity and the student's welfare. In that context, we can support a proposal at the 1995 Convention. We cannot support the proposal at this time for an additional scholarship in men's basketball.

Betty Jaynes (Women's Basketball Coaches Association): Our coaches have discussed this at length. We feel that the addition of 14 scholarships is very important to our colleagues in men's basketball because it disproportionately affects many students from an opportunity to receive a basketball scholarship. The number 14 is in the spirit of the 10-percent reduction in cost for athletics programs. The Women's Basketball Coaches Association asks your support of this proposal.

Eamon Kelly (Tulane University): The across-the-board cuts that were adopted at the 1991 Convention in Division I was 273 to 52. That is more than five to one. It was overwhelming. I do not believe that the Division I membership has changed since that across-the-board cost reduction in just three years.

I would think our resolve to obtain this very modest 10-percent cut in all sports would be greater, not less. I understand that everyone wants to protect their own turf. But this is one that we should not change. I urge Division I to defeat this proposal.

Don DiJulia (St. Joseph's University, Pennsylvania): On behalf of the NCAA Men's and Women's Committee on Basketball Issues, we urge your support of this permissive legislation to adjust the maximum awards in men's basketball. This proposal will not destroy the spirit of the game. It will not open the floodgates. It will achieve a balance between academics and athletics and will not distort equity and financial concerns.

Yesterday, we were told to have an open mind to refinement. The 10-percent, across-the-board reduction in men and women's basketball was 14.5 scholarships. A decision to round the number upward is consistent with the decision to review and refine the women's basketball limit when special circumstances presented themselves last year. We have added limits to an emerging sport this year.

Basketball has been unique and special for this Association. To support this proposal is to uphold a commitment to reform or refine, whichever is necessary. A positive vote on No. 42 will enhance access and opportunities for additional Division I student-athletes at a time when their interests and welfare are in the forefront.

When making this judgment call, we suggest that you give the benefit of the doubt to increased opportunities by refining this 10-percent reduction by simply rounding up the limit to 14.

Thomas K. Hearn Jr. (Wake Forest University): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I speak in opposition to this proposal.

The world would probably be like Mr. Lincoln's little note, "Long remember what we say here." The world would certainly not forget how we vote here.

The money involved is relatively small, but the principle is relatively large. The principle matters hugely. In higher education, we have been looking to see if this organization can stay focused on reform. Financial reform is certainly crucial. The matter is critical on our campuses, where most of our academic programs are facing financial exodus. How can we roll back in athletics what we cannot do for our libraries and instructional centers in developing programs. We are opening the door for other groups to claim that it has been unfairly treated.

Perhaps above all, there is the credibility of this Association. In 1991, we made this decision by a huge majority and reaffirmed this decision last year. But here we are again with a new set of pressures trying to decide whether we can once and for all make up our mind

on what is a fairly simple matter.

Let's don't set forth two steps forward and two backward. We must not yield on maintaining the kind of financial integrity of our athletic programs that are required of our entire institutional structure.

Judith E. N. Albino (University of Colorado, Boulder): Speaking on behalf of the Presidents Commission, from a very personal perspective I believe in cost containment. I also believe in some respects that we have not done our job on cost containment. What we have here is a very important matter of cost containment.

This is not just one more scholarship in basketball. We need to look at our overall program and scholarships and define what we have done. Have we limited access in ways we don't want to? This is what we mean by refinement.

We can only do that if we look at these matters within the total context of what we are making available in scholarships and in terms of the support that would be provided throughout our program. So, the basic point is not just whether we are going to add one more scholarship in basketball. The point is that it is in the philosophy, not in the detail. We either support cost containment and reform or we do not. This is an attempt to roll back a highly visible part of that reform movement and one that we simply cannot afford to take at this point in time. When I say "afford," I don't mean in dollars. Greg O'Brien said the Presidents Commission is willing to work on this issue to look at the overall passage in terms of scholarships. I would like the opportunity to do that.

I would like to do that in a context in which this will not just be a basketball issue. I ask you to defeat this motion. The Presidents Commission has proposed only eight motions in this Convention. We are very concerned that they do not get into micromanagement. This is one that takes on far more importance than it should, but one in which we cannot back away. I ask you to defeat the motion.

James Haney (National Association of Basketball Coaches): This proposal was offered out of concern that scholarships in men's basketball have been reduced from 15 to 13.

It is really unfortunate that we have come to a point where so much emotion has been generated over this particular proposal. I think it was borne out of concern for young people and whether there is opportunity to participate in college basketball. We need to respect the needs for cost reduction. The NABC worked with the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics to try to find a way to reduce costs in basketball. They offered four proposals beyond what the special committee had proposed to address other ways to reduce the cost.

So we deeply respect the need for the Association to reduce costs. From our standpoint we have to come down on the side of the student-athlete.

John L. Allen (University of Connecticut): I really wish this issue had not become so symbolic. When we get involved in symbols, we

tend to lose sight of some of the things that we are all here for. We are dealing with access to education.

Granted, the numbers are not high, but they are significant. We are talking about the addition of approximately 330 athletics grants-in-aid per year. That is not likely to break any of us. It is symbolic. Sure, it is symbolic. But in my mind, it is symbolic in the right way. Our concern should be for cost containment. There is no question about that. Let me remind you we are talking about one athletics grant-in-aid per institution. It has been expressed by members of the Presidents Commission that we can't afford to do this. I would submit to you that we can't afford not to do this. The cost per institution of the addition of one scholarship in basketball is far less than the social cost of not adding the one scholarship per institution. This is particularly true given the fact that the majority of the 300 grants-in-aid will be minority student-athletes.

The social benefits to be obtained from adding one scholarship in basketball per institution far outweighs the cost. I normally support the Presidents Commission on almost all the issues. On this one, I have to say I don't support it. I strongly urge the delegates to vote in the affirmative.

Dennis M. Coleman (Black Coaches Association): On behalf of the Black Coaches Association, I strongly urge all members to support this legislation.

In listening to the gentleman from Connecticut, I got chills over my body when he talked about symbolism. We spent all morning discussing and trying to work out ways to get people to help others. Greg O'Brien tried to find ways to prevent this from happening. We at the Black Coaches Association affirmatively believe that these 330 scholarships are critically important to our community. It is critically important in the sense of the message that will go out to thousands of young black men who are underdeveloped in our society. We are losing every day black men from our younger generation. The only access some of them are going to get is through scholarships like this. It will not be my son. I will be able to pay for my kids to go to school. Most of you will be able to do the same. There will be some young kid who is lost somewhere. His only access is going to be through the scholarship. I believe in my heart that Greg O'Brien and the people in the NCAA want to maintain 13 scholarships. I believe that we can try ways to find that.

Unfortunately, the process does not allow us the opportunity to sit down right now and come to some conclusion and resolution of this matter. If we can bring it back next year, we can do it now. We have the ability to save 330 young men now, not next year. On behalf of the Black Coaches Association, its leadership and its members, I ask that everyone here support what we are trying to do with the scholarships.

Charles Young (University of California, Los Angeles): I ask that the members of the Convention vote against this proposal.

The point was made by the speaker once removed that it is a shame that this has become symbolic. I agree with that. But, unfortunately, it is symbolic because it is important. In moving the proposal, a good friend of mine, a president of one of the Big 10 Institutions, commented that there is a need for this to bring about something closer to equity between the men and women's programs.

The fact that that reason is given and the fact that there is a reason that that reason can be given is the best indication of why we need to vote against this that I can think of. When the proposal came up to modify the limitation of scholarships for women's basketball, I supported the reasons for which that exception was made when legislation came before the Presidents Commission. But I had to point out at that time that the fact we were making that exception would be used within a year or two in making exceptions in the men's program. If we make an exception in the men's program, because there is a difference between the women's and the men's program, we are going to be here next year talking about a roll back in the baseball program, because it is unfair to have the baseball program remain where it is and make exceptions for the basketball program.

It is important that we maintain the kind of direction and pressure that has been applied over the last several years to bring about the kinds of changes that have been made. It is very clear that if this proposal is passed, we will see a move backward in a direction we do not want to go for reasons that are not sound.

I urge the members of the Convention to vote against Proposal No. 42.

Thomas J. Scanlan (Manhattan College): I urge you to vote against Proposal No. 42.

I would like to say a word in terms of perspective. I take exception to some of the connections being made between 14 scholarships in men's basketball and the larger issue of higher education and access for minority and generally disadvantaged students. That is not a good connection to make. All of our institutions are committed to greater access to all of the young people of America. All of our institutions must spend annually some \$3 million in institutionally funded financial aid to provide access to these disadvantaged students. Most if not all of our institutions have outreach programs to disadvantaged students. To talk about supporting Proposal 42 as the way for the youth of America to get access to higher education, I think lacks perspective. It is one of the things that has hurt athletics in higher education since it has become symbolic. People have put too much emphasis on their sport and have not looked at the overall facts and commitment of higher education.

On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge you to vote against Proposal No. 42.

[Proposal No. 42 (page A-78) was defeated by Division I, 119-91, 17 abstentions.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Basketball Practice

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): I move Proposal No. 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

Chris Monasch (Northeast Conference): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I speak in support of this proposal.

The steering committee agrees with the sponsors that moving the starting date for basketball practice to November 1 without also moving the starting date for competition unnecessarily compressed the preparation time of student-athletes. We therefore ask your support of this proposal.

Betty Jaynes (Women's Basketball Coaches Association): I ask your support on behalf of the coaches of women's basketball for the movement of the starting time back to the October date and moving the starting date for the sport of basketball to November 1. Without a corresponding adjustment to the starting date of the competition, it is counterproductive to the needs of the student-athlete. We would ask for your support.

James Haney (American Basketball Coaches Association): There are two different amendments that address the starting date for basketball. The NABC supports Proposal No. 47.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, we also support Proposal No. 47.

[Proposal No. 47 (page A-83) was adopted by Division I, 266-61, three abstentions.]

Resolution: Review of Initial-Eligibility Requirements

Joseph N. Crowley (University of Nevada, Reno): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 174.

[The motion was seconded.]

At this juncture, I move that there be a roll-call vote on this proposal.

[The motion was seconded.]

There are a few points that need to be made about this resolution. First of all, with respect to the intent, it is desired to have a thorough and complete review of Convention Proposal No. 16 from 1992. That would include a review of all the available data, particularly the impact that proposal had on minority student-athletes. Also, the resolution recognizes the importance of studying and assessing the level of understanding among high-school students, coaches and counselors of the initial-eligibility standards in that legislation. It also will determine the effectiveness of our communication of those standards since we passed that proposal in 1992.

It is important to note that this resolution does not assume nor does it prejudge what will be the results of this review. You will note that the resolution specifies that as a result of the review, Proposal No. 17 could be maintained, delayed, amended or altered so that all options are open. The resolution also is open to the question of who is

to be involved in the review of this issue. This is important. It is important that we maintain maximum flexibility to ensure that all the appropriate groups are represented in the review process.

Finally, the reason for the June 1994 date for reporting the results to the Council and the Commission is simply that the proposed legislation for our next Convention is the consequence of this review and it must be submitted by the appropriate legislative deadlines. So the June 1994 deadline does not commit anybody to propose legislation. It simply calls for a report by that time. If it is deemed appropriate then to propose legislation or to delay the day of the implementation of Proposal 16, it can be done by the legislative deadline for the 1995 Convention.

Kenneth A. Shaw (Syracuse University): The Presidents Commission supports this resolution, but it wants to make clear that support will in no way represent the backing off of its desire to increase academic equity of students.

This resolution allows for a review of all the available research. It resolves that we look at Proposal No. 16's impact on minorities and how well that proposal is understood by students and others. It also acknowledges that there is no predetermined outcome, no view as to what this review will yield. We believe that it is in the spirit of the executive director's comments yesterday that we support it.

Karl P. Mooney (National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics): The National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics is not opposed to higher standards for eligibility. As colleges and universities standards increase, so too must our starts for initial eligibility if we wish to maintain the opportunities for collegiate education.

However, in their contact with high-school principals, counselors, parents and student-athletes, it is clear that the majority of student-athlete prospects are unaware of the standards of Proposal 16. Most individuals vaguely recall being informed by television announcements that began during the men's basketball tournament in 1993. At that point in time, those individuals who would be the first to be impacted by Proposal No. 16 in August 1995, already had completed half of their high-school education without focusing toward higher standards. If past history is a teacher, higher standards of Proposal No. 16 should be gradually acquired, as when Proposal 48 was first enacted.

The National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics joins the Presidents Commission and urges your support of Resolution No. 174.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): Speaking on behalf of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference, we unanimously support the resolution proposed by the Council and endorsed by the Presidents Commission. We urge the body to follow suit with support of this resolution.

Hunter R. Rawlings III (University of Iowa): For the Presidents

Commission, I would like to take a strong view in favor of what President Fort just said. We support this review. On behalf of the Commission, however, I would like to emphasize that this is not to make any prejudgment of the results of the review. I would like to emphasize again what President Shaw said about backing off from these standards. We expect that this review will be conducted carefully and in-depth.

Judith E. N. Albino (University of Colorado, Boulder): I would strongly support the academic standards. There is nothing more important to my institution and yours than strong academic standards. On the national level, there is no association that has taken a clearer and stronger stand on academic standards than has the NCAA.

This is an important issue to us and one that you cannot pass up. I believe that we have done the right thing in defining initial-eligibility standards. They were given careful thought. They have been looked at by many. Yet, particularly over the past few days and weeks, I hear concerns. I have listened to them carefully. Because this matter is so very important to all of us, we do want to make absolutely certain that we have done the right thing, that we are going in the right direction and that no particular group would be affected by these standards.

I urge you to support this resolution. It is an opportunity to look and to be sure. We want to make sure we have done our homework and that we are putting in place exactly what we mean to put in place. It is a way for us to come together again and to share our common purposes and goals, and to make sure that we are still going in the right direction with academic-eligibility standards. I urge your support for this resolution.

James Haney (National Association of Basketball Coaches): Although we obviously differ on the previous proposal, we are strongly in favor of this resolution. I think it is vitally important that this does take place. We appreciate the efforts that were made to put this in a resolution form and to come back next year.

[Resolution No. 174 (page A-215) was adopted by Division I, 311-10, two abstentions.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Divisions I and II Baseball

Bill Belknap (Wichita State University): I move Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

This would extend the playing and practice season in the sport of baseball from 22 to 24 weeks. The primary consideration is the unpredictable weather and how it affects certain programs. We urge that flexibility be granted by the Association.

James G. Malik (San Diego State University): On behalf of the Council, I wish to speak in opposition to this proposal.

This proposal adds two weeks to the baseball-playing season, which is directly contrary to the spirit of work demands on student-athletes. I urge your defeat of this proposal.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): The

Presidents Commission strongly concurs with the Council. The two-week extension is contrary to the work demands on the time of the student-athlete. We urge your defeat of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 50 (page A-87) was defeated by Division I, 45-268, 12 abstentions.]

Volunteer Coach

Constance B. Hurlbut (Patriot League): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

Our proposal is to recognize the volunteer coach. The NCAA's leadership has done so by allowing the volunteer coach to travel and to participate in the coaching of NCAA championships. We ask that it be directed to do it in football as well.

Doris R. Soladay (Syracuse University): On behalf of the Council, I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 57. Allowing the volunteer coach to receive expenses to travel to away games will inevitably increase institutional cost.

A volunteer coach is supposed to be just that—a volunteer who does not receive the same expenses and compensation as other coaches do. I urge you to vote "no" on this proposal.

Carl Ullrich (U.S. Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association): I hope I'm not presumptuous in thinking that I would like to speak to the coaches in all sports that would benefit by this legislation.

I know the Convention has a great deal of weighty things to consider this morning. I hope that you will all truly listen to this one, which I know is important to many folks on your staff who are dealing with student-athletes in various ways.

I would like to make three quick points. Bylaw 11.02.6, Paragraph A, which actually specifies that the volunteer coach may not travel to away competitions, will not be part of the original legislation. It was inserted there by the Interpretations and Legislative Review Committees. I can't image that any of us who were involved in the formulation of and the presentation of that legislation would have thought that interpretation would have ever been made.

Secondly, with all due respect to the Council, allowing volunteer coaches to travel to away contests, for most institutions, is not a high cost or perhaps even no cost. It is another seat on the bus. It is half of a room probably shared with another staff member. Ultimately, the cost is a couple of meals. For a team traveling by air, this will be made on an as-needed basis.

Finally, as was pointed out last year, the NCAA put some legitimacy into the whole idea of this legislation by allowing the volunteer coach to travel to NCAA championships. I urge your vote for this legislation for that reason, but perhaps for an even more important reason—to legitimize this coaching position and to prevent humiliation for that particular coach. Let's let him serve in a full way with the coaching family and as a part of the team family. Please support this legislation.

Gary A. Sojka (Bucknell University): As a university president and member of the Presidents Commission, I think that by now it is obvious that we are on the side of cost containment whenever possible.

Thus, it may come as a surprise to some that I speak in favor of this proposal. I disagree fundamentally with the concept that it adds to the cost. The volunteer coaching concept provides us with more hands-on coaching, more counseling, more support, more mentorship and more of the educational benefits that we claim to provide to our students, but at very little cost. This is one of the most cost-effective things that we do. By supporting this proposal, we provide an opportunity to optimize that cost effectiveness by providing coaching continuity from the practice session to the game situation. We do balance coaching inequities with home teams and traveling teams in sports other than football and basketball.

I urge you to reconcile the present situation where we permit volunteer coaches in sports other than basketball and football to travel to championship play and extend that into the regular season.

David B. Keilitz (Central Michigan University): With the loss of the full-time coach in football and basketball, the volunteer coaches become critical. The Special Committee to Study Rules Federation by Sport would support this proposal. The benefits for student-athletes greatly outweigh the minimal cost. We urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 57 (page A-94) was adopted by Division I.]

Noninstitutional Publications

Robert Goin (Florida State University): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 58.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is intended to permit an athletics staff member to write educational articles relating to NCAA rules and crowd control for noninstitutional publications dedicated to reporting on an institution's athletics activities, provided the staff member does not receive compensation for writing such articles.

Current legislation prohibiting athletics staff members from writing articles for noninstitutional publications was adopted at the 1993 Convention in response to concern expressed about compensation being provided to athletics staff members for endorsing these publications or for writing articles about their institution's athletics programs. The practice is contrary to the principles set forth in Bylaw 11.3.2.6, which I am sure everyone here is very much familiar with. I am not going to explain that to you. It is important that athletics department staff members be able to write articles in such publications about NCAA regulations in order to educate the individuals about the application of legislation in situations in which they may become involved.

It is probably accurate to say that a large majority are not athletics representatives. Boosters and fans have specific institutional athletics programs. Such publications serve as a beneficial forum to educate boosters and fans of that institution's rules regarding applicable

NCAA rules, crowd control and concerns.

Further, the principle in Bylaw 11.3.6 will not apply inasmuch as staff members will not receive compensation for writing these articles. I urge your support of Proposal 58.

[Proposal No. 58 (page A-95) was adopted by Division I.]

Scouting of Opponents—Division I

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Football Conference): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 60.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal incorporates the current interpretation of the request about travel when scouting opponents. It specifies that when an individual is being reimbursed for scouting travel, others in the same automobile cannot receive transportation costs.

As already noted, this is moot because of the passage of No. 24, which was on basketball. I would urge your support.

[Proposal No. 60 (page A-96) was adopted by Division I.]

Drug-Testing Consent Form and Squad List—Nonrecruited Student-Athlete

Charles Cavagnaro (Memphis State University): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, I move Proposal No. 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment is due in part to the administrative burden of processing the drug-testing consent form. The safeguards committee supports the amendment, which in no way compromises the year-round testing program inasmuch as sports included in year-round testing are already in this legislative amendment. The safeguards committee recommended Proposal No. 62 and the Council exercised its authority to modify the wording to indicate that any sport included in the NCAA year-round drug-testing program be exempted from this legislation.

We'll need to modify that legislation if Division I sports other than football and track are added to the NCAA drug-testing program. I urge the support of Proposal No. 62.

[Proposal No. 62 (page A-98) was adopted by Division I.]

Season of Competition

Dennis A. Farrell (Big West Conference): I move adoption of Proposal No. 63 on behalf of the Council and Two-Year College Relations Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

As the rationale statement of this proposal indicates, exempting preseason scrimmages from counting as a season of competition for two-year college athletes will help reduce the vulnerability of NCAA institutions in allowing a student-athlete to compete who may not be eligible. This proposal is in the best interest of the student-athlete. It protects the student-athlete should he or she receive inaccurate information from an unreliable source. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 63 (page A-99) was adopted by Division I.]

Two-Year College Hardship Waiver—Division I
Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): I move Proposal No. 64.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council, I urge you to support this proposal in the spirit of student-athlete welfare. Some of you will remember that the Two-Year College Relations Committee proposed the rule in 1992 to allow Division I schools to honor hardships granted by two-year colleges.

At that time, student-athletes who were attending Division I schools were not grandfathered by this new regulation. This generated a number of appeals to the Administrative Review Panel. Both the committee and the review panel believe that student-athletes who currently are attending NCAA schools should be allowed to take advantage of the regulation that has already been adopted for those student-athletes who entered school in 1992 and thereafter. Student-athletes in these situations should not be disqualified from consideration for hardship waivers merely because they enrolled in an institution before August 1, 1992. Safeguards built into the rules will assure that any hardship that is granted will meet strict review standards. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 64 (page A-100) was adopted by Division I.]

[The Division I business session was recessed at 1 p.m.]

Tuesday Morning, January 11, 1994

The Division I business session was called to order at 9:45 a.m. with Vice-President R. Elaine Dreidame presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Dreidame: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. We are now ready to commence the Division I business session.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Initial Eligibility—Core Curriculum Requirements

Charles Whitcomb (San Jose State University): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 65.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am sure that most of you recall adopting legislation at last year's Convention to specify that effective August 1, 1996, prospective student-athletes must complete at least one core course in algebra and one course in geometry to be eligible upon enrollment.

One technical flaw in that proposal is that it precluded a student from using a more advanced math course to fulfill that requirement, even if the student had to complete geometry in order to enroll in that more advanced course. For example, let's say a student successfully completes algebra I and struggles with geometry, and then rallies and does fine with trigonometry. The way the legislation is cur-

rently written, the student would have to use the less favorable geometry grade even though the student subsequently used the knowledge gained in geometry to succeed to trigonometry. The new rule would prevent the student from using the better trigonometry grade to fulfill that mathematic core-course requirements. That does not seem right.

This proposal simply permits a student to take a more advanced course that meets the math core-course requirement, provided the student also had to complete geometry to enroll in that course. The Academic Requirements Committee has reviewed the College Board study that formed the basis of last year's legislation. This proposal is consistent with that study. I urge you to support this proposal.

William B. DeLauder (Delaware State University): As the author of the proposal last year that led to strengthening the eligibility-core requirements, this modification is consistent with our view that the best thing we can do for our student-athletes is to ensure that they get the kind of education in algebra and other important subjects to make sure they can be successful in college. I urge your support of this resolution.

[Proposal No. 65 (page A-101) was adopted by Division I.]

Full-Time Enrollment—Correspondence Courses

Lt. Gen. Claudius E. Watts III (The Citadel): I move Proposal No. 67.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council and as a member of the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee, I urge your favorable support of this proposal.

It is intended to strengthen the Association's academic standards by precluding the use of correspondence courses for purposes of establishing full-time enrollment. Correspondence courses are subject to abuse. Proposal 67 will not preclude a student from using correspondence courses to satisfy certain requirements for their degree. It simply requires students to establish their minimum full-time program by using hours other than correspondence courses.

[Proposal No. 67 (page A-104) was adopted by Division I.]

Regular Academic Year—Correspondence Courses

Mary Jo Wynn (Southwest Missouri State University): I move Proposal No. 68.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council and as a member of the Academic Requirements Committee, I urge you to support this proposal.

This proposal confirms the official interpretation that correspondence courses taken during the 1993-94 academic year and thereafter shall not count as regular academic-year courses to fulfill the new "75/25" satisfactory-progress rule. The Academic Requirements Committee has received concerns from various institutional and conference administrators regarding the use of correspondence courses to circumvent the legislative intent of that rule. It should be noted

Division I Business Session _____ 239

that this proposal will not affect correspondence courses taken during the 1992-93 academic year inasmuch as a prior permissive committee interpretation regarding the use of correspondence courses had been widely disseminated.

This proposal will not affect the ability of student-athletes to use correspondence courses to fulfill the Association's other new satisfactory-progress requirements, such as the "25/50/75" rule, and the "90/95" percent rule.

I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 68 (page A-105) was adopted by Division I.]

Satisfactory Progress—Midyear Certification Option

Prentice Gautt (Big Eight Conference): I move Proposal No. 69.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council and the Academic Requirements Committee, I request your support of Proposal 69. The implementation of the upcoming minimum grade-point average, or the "90/95" rule, and the degree program requirements of the "25/50/75" rule will be an administrative burden at best.

Approval of No. 69 would avoid further complications when eligibility is reinstated at midyear, as the sufficient satisfactory standard is fulfilled. Keep in mind that the students who have to use the midyear certification option will continue to be held accountable for the satisfactory-progress requirements applied at the beginning of the ensuing fall term.

Accordingly, these students must get themselves back on track to meet the academic standards by the next ensuing fall term. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 69 (page A-105) was adopted by Division I.]

Satisfactory Progress—Part-Time Enrollment

Jerry L. Kingston (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Council and the Academic Requirements Committee, I move Proposal No. 70.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal specifies that the credit hours earned during the time in which the student-athlete is not responsible for satisfactory progress cannot be used to fulfill the Association's satisfactory-progress requirements.

Please note that it refers only to a situation in which the student-athlete initially enrolls as a part-time student. If the student enrolled initially as a full-time student and then during the course of the term had to reduce his or her enrollment to part-time status, that student would still be held responsible for satisfactory progress for that term. Therefore, the credit hours earned during that term would be countable for satisfactory progress.

The impact of this proposal would be to treat student-athletes in spring-semester sports in the same manner as those in fall-semester sports. Currently, a student-athlete could enroll as a part-time student in the fall term, and then use the fall term hours to meet the

cumulative satisfactory-progress rule for midyear certification that would not include being responsible for that fall term. This proposal would treat hours earned while a part-time student in precisely the same manner as satisfactory progress is calculated under the "missed term" exception.

On behalf of the Council and the Academic Requirements Committee, I urge the Convention to support Proposal No. 70.

[Proposal No. 70 (page A-107) was adopted by Division I.]

Eligibility—Five-Year/10-Semester Rule

Robert M. Sweazy (Texas Tech University): On behalf of the Council and the Eligibility Committee, I move Proposal No. 71.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this legislation is to allow the Eligibility Committee more flexibility in its authority to grant extensions of eligibility to innocent student-athletes with unusual circumstances.

Before the creation of the Administrative Review Panel, extensions were granted only when student-athletes were unable to attend collegiate institutions for documented reasons. Since last year's Convention, the Administrative Review Panel has considered several appeals for what appeared to be compelling documented situations that warrant such action, even though the reasons did not meet the current criteria. As a result, the panel recommended and the Eligibility Committee and the Council agreed that the Eligibility Committee should consider all the appeals related to the five-year/10-semester rule, and that the provisions of Bylaw 30.6.1 should be modified to provide the Eligibility Committee with this broader authority.

On behalf of the Council and the Eligibility Committee, I encourage you to adopt this proposal.

[Proposal No. 71 (page A-107) was adopted by Division I.]

Academic Degree Requirements—Two-Year College Transfers

Mary Jo Wynn (Southwest Missouri State University): On behalf of the Council and the Academic Requirements Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 72.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal specifies that at least 25 percent of the credit hours used to fulfill the academic-degree requirement of a two-year college transfer student must be earned at the junior college that awards the degree.

It will establish an academic requirement that is comparable to the one academic year in residence that four-year colleges traditionally require in order to confer a degree. Transfer students should not be permitted to fulfill the Association's transfer requirements merely by attending a "degree mill" that will award associate degrees to students who have completed little or no actual course work at that institution.

The Academic Requirements Committee and the Two-Year College Relations Committee strongly support this legislation. I urge you to adopt it.

[Proposal No. 72 (page A-108) was adopted by Division I.]

Eligibility—Two-Year College Transfer

Jerry L. Kingston (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 73.

[The motion was seconded.]

Under the current legislation, the student-athlete who transfers from a four-year institution during the academic year could represent both four-year institutions against outside competition during the same academic year, provided the student-athlete meets the exception to the transfer-residence requirement.

It is the belief of the Recruiting Committee and the Council that it is only equitable to allow a two-year transfer student the same opportunity if the student has only participated in regularly scheduled scrimmages at a two-year college.

Your support of this proposal will provide both consistent and equitable treatment of these transfer students. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of this resolution.

[Proposal No. 73 (page A-109) was adopted by Division I.]

Outside Competition—Division I

W. James Copeland (University of Virginia): On behalf of all members of the Atlantic Coast Conference, I move Proposal No. 76.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation will permit student-athletes in sports other than basketball to participate as a member of an outside team in noncollegiate amateur competition during the official vacation period, provided this competition occurs outside their team's playing and practice season.

The primary intent of the legislation this body adopted three years ago prohibiting participation by an enrolled student-athlete on an outside team during the academic year, including the vacation periods, was to reduce cost for institutions and time demands on student-athletes. Competition by student-athletes during the vacation periods occurring outside their team's playing practice season would not have a negative impact on student-athlete's academic or collegiate activities or increase institutional costs. Is it appropriate or fair to legislate what a student-athlete can do during their free time and at their own expense during the vacation break?

Before enrollment at an NCAA institution, many student-athletes have been competing in these vacation activities for years. But as soon as they enroll in an NCAA member institution, they can no longer participate. The sponsors believe that Proposal No. 76 is in the best interest of the student-athlete and results in no burden to the institution.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 76. I also urge your support.

James Dyer (National Soccer Coaches Association): Speaking on behalf of the National Soccer Coaches Association, I stand in favor of Proposal No. 76. It would allow off-season competition for student-athletes.

The intent of the existing restrictions on outside competition is to decrease time demands on student-athletes. Obviously, during a vacation period this would not be the case. Current bylaws restrict competitive opportunities and development of Olympic sports activity in sports such as field hockey, soccer and volleyball.

Division II and Division III athletes have no such restrictions. The athletes have continued to play in outside competition during vacation periods, which has no adverse effect on their academic pursuits.

As Rafer Johnson so vividly pointed out Sunday evening, supporting the NCAA allows our student-athletes the opportunity to be the best they can be. I urge your support of Proposal No. 76 for those student-athletes who pursue excellence in the sport of their choice.

Erik Nedean (Northeastern University/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The committee supports Proposal No. 76. Participation with an outside team during a recognized vacation period without jeopardizing eligibility would benefit the student-athlete. During vacation periods there are a lot of recreational and international athletics competitions. The institution will not incur any expenses by allowing the student-athlete to voluntarily participate with an outside team during this period.

Also, with the absence of any academic obligations, the student-athlete will be able to focus solely on the competition and thus obtain optimal performance. This is in the best interest of the student-athlete. We support Proposal No. 76.

[Proposal No. 76 (page A-111) was adopted by Division I.]

Summer Basketball Leagues—Transfer Student

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to specify that a student-athlete who transfers from a four-year institution and has been officially accepted for enrollment at the second institution and receives permission from that institution to participate in a sanctioned summer basketball league does not count on the summer-league roster as a representative of either institution.

Under current legislation, prospects who are incoming freshmen and two-year college transfers do not count in the summer-basketball limitations established for the institution they will attend in the ensuing academic year. The Interpretations Committee recommended this proposal to the Council because it believes that a prospective student-athlete transferring from one four-year institution to another should be treated in the same manner as an incoming prospective student-athlete.

Thus, he or she should not be included in the summer-basketball league limitations for the institution to which he or she will be transferring for the next academic year. I urge your support of Proposal No. 77.

[Proposal No. 77 (page A-113) was adopted by Division I.]

Financial Aid—Employment Earnings and Athletics Participation Compensation

Charles S. Harris (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I move Proposal No. 81.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the 1993 Convention, the membership adopted legislation to exempt employment earnings from being included in student-athletes' individual limits when employment is obtained after they have exhausted their eligibility in the prior term. The Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism believe it is more equitable to permit student-athletes to exempt employment earnings any time after exhausting eligibility, rather than being required to wait until the beginning of the next regular term.

This proposal would also permit a student-athlete to exempt any compensation received for athletics participation that occurs after eligibility has been exhausted for things such as "barnstorming" tours. I urge your adoption of this legislation.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I rise and speak on behalf of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference to support Arizona State University. We urge that the entire delegation vote "yes" on Proposal 81.

[Parts A and B of Proposal No. 81 (page A-116) were adopted by Division I.]

Financial Aid—Division I Ice Hockey

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 91.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to permit a recruited student-athlete in Division I ice hockey to receive institutional financial aid and engage in varsity competition without being considered a counter, provided the aid is granted without regard to athletics ability. Legislation was adopted at last year's Convention that established reasonable and acceptable grant-in-aid equivalencies and head-count limits in Division I ice hockey. It included an additional restriction that was not intended by its sponsors or by the majority of the Division I ice hockey membership, namely, the need to count players who were recruited but receive nonathletically related aid.

This year's proposal corrects that unintended restriction and treats student-athletes who receive such aid in the sport of ice hockey the same as athletes are treated in all sports other than football and basketball.

Terrence J. Toy (University of Denver): We made a mistake with the passage of Proposal No. 31. Nonathletically based financial aid was required to be included in the equivalency calculations for ice hockey. There was no provision in the legislation for grandfathering student-athletes who were already in residence. All appeals to the appropriate NCAA committee were rejected. The specific impact in

our case was to leave the institution with two choices: to remove the institutional aid from the student-athlete already in residence, or to prohibit the student-athletes from participating in the sport.

This case was particularly troublesome to the student-athlete in our case because he had already encountered considerable personal strife and overcome a number of serious family problems. He had straightened out his life and was back on course at the time we pulled the rug out from underneath him. In keeping with Article II of the Constitution—the principle of the student-athlete welfare—it states that "intercollegiate athletics programs should be conducted in a manner designed to protect and enhance the physical and educational welfare of the student-athlete."

On behalf of the student-athlete, his wife and son, I urge positive support for this particular proposal and our appeal. This proposal is not opposed by the Council or the Presidents Commission. I urge your affirmation of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 91 (page A-127) was adopted by Division I.]

Maximum Awards—Women's Gymnastics

Cheryl Levick (Stanford University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

As chair of the NCAA Women's Gymnastics Committee, I speak on behalf of its members in support of Proposal No. 92.

This proposal is identical to the recommendations of the NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force, which is scheduled to be reviewed by this body in 1996. However, for the following reasons, you cannot wait for two years to bring this proposal to the membership. There has been a significant number of rules changes mandated by the USA Gymnastics Association over the last five years that have created a need to increase our scholarship numbers and our participation numbers.

One of these is no all-around requirement. Because of this change, we will have up to 24 competitors instead of our recent 10 to 12. Our current NCAA limit of scholarships is ineffective to recruit and retain the competitive squad. The NCAA Women's Gymnastics Committee recommends increasing squad size from 12 to 15 and the number of allowable competitors from six to seven. Before the domino effect, we need an increase in scholarships before we can increase the number of participants and the number of competitors.

The second reason is health and safety. We have a strong concern about the injuries in our sport. Our current squad sizes and scholarship limitations do not permit rest or substitution of our gymnasts. This proposal would permit an increase and hopefully eliminate this problem.

Third, this is a gender-equity issue. This proposal would allow the needed changes in our rules and at the same time would be in compliance with Title IX regulations. In short, it increases the opportunity for female athletes and the use of existing facilities by more female athletes. It also increases our scholarships allocations to female

athletes. In short, it complies with Title IX regulations.

We recommend that we listen to what the Presidents Commission said about acting affirmatively toward gender equity and support this proposal.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I move that this item be referred to the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism or another appropriate committee of the NCAA.

The Council has referred all of the recommendations on specific scholarship proposals from the Gender-Equity Task Force to the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism for its review and action at our 1995 Convention, which will focus on access, equity and student welfare.

We believe this would be an appropriate place to have this reviewed. We strongly urge that this motion be referred to that committee for action at the 1995 Convention.

[The motion was seconded.]

Chris Voelz (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I would like to speak as an athletics director in favor of adding these two scholarships at this time. This is an immediate way to increase opportunities for women within an existing framework of a coaching staff and facilities.

Let us take this opportunity to put our vote where our values are. After all, isn't this the only real legislation that in a concrete manner adds any opportunities for women at this Convention, that once was called the "gender-equity Convention?"

We regret to be in opposition to the Presidents Commission, but we ask that you vote for this only concrete item that adds real opportunities at this Convention.

Yvonne Sandmire (Boise State University): I am president of the National Association of Gymnastics Coaches for Women. We oppose referral of this proposal and urge a vote on No. 92 today for the following reasons.

If you look at the proposal source list, you will notice a wide variety of school sizes and conferences represented. You will see traditional champions, schools on the bubble, and emerging programs from across the United States. A primary reason for this wide support is the safety and well-being of our athletes. The high-school level of women's gymnastics places tremendous demands on the college athlete's body. The nature of this sport allows for even a slightly injured gymnast to go to the sidelines. Substitution of gymnasts for rest and to reduce injuries will raise the level of safety in this sport.

A second benefit is increased participation. The rules changes that have already gone into effect, plus the ones that will go into effect, allow for up to 24 athletes to compete. We do not have enough scholarships to fill full teams in many cases. Two additional grants will increase educational opportunities for the thousands of gymnasts who compete in high-school programs as well as more than 54,000

gymnastics club participants and countless community program participants. There is no shortage of high-level recruitable female gymnasts out there eager for the opportunity for a college education.

The third reason is for cost effectiveness and cost containment. The addition of participants will not necessitate additional funds for coaches and staff salaries, office space, practice or competition facilities. Institutions therefore can maximize the use of their existing facilities they have. Institutions choosing not to increase funding for women gymnastics and scholarships would, with the passage of this proposal, have the opportunity of spreading their existing funds over two more participants.

Finally, it is important to point out that a number of institutions with the existing maximum limit of 10 women's gymnastics scholarships have been at times unable to field a full team. This has been detrimental to both the disadvantaged team and to their opponents. If you could imagine a basketball game played five on four, you will get the idea of what this is like. Increasing the scholarship for women's gymnastics will lessen the likelihood of this situation arising in the future.

In conclusion, the passage of this proposal will increase the safety and well-being of our athletes and will increase opportunities for female athletes in a cost-effective manner. I, along with the National Association of Collegiate Women's Gymnastics Coaches, urge your vote in support of this proposal.

Charles Young (University of California, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I speak in support of the motion to refer.

I spoke yesterday with regard to Proposal 42. I believe that the same principles apply here. This is a reduction that was made in accordance with the general reduction of the numbers of grants-in-aid for all sports required of the reform movement.

As Executive Director Dempsey said, we ought to be prepared to refine where refinement is required on the actions we have taken earlier. But we ought to do that refinement in the context of the total program of the institutions involved. In addition to the other reasons that have been given, the fact that we would be treating this differently from the way we treated Proposal 42 yesterday is an important factor to bear in mind. I believe as a part of gender equity we need to react and act the same with regard to this proposal as we did with regard to No. 42. I urge the members of the Convention to support the motion to refer to the committee.

Ann Marie Lawler (University of Florida): I would like to speak against referral. It was my understanding that gender equity was to be a major part of this Convention. This is an opportunity to vote on a gender-equity proposal.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 92 (page A-128) to an appropriate NCAA committee was adopted by Division I.]

Required Day Off During Playing Season

Charles S. Harris (Arizona State University): On behalf of the men's basketball committee, of which I am a member, and with the support of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 93.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal emanated from concerns from the men's basketball committee to the Interpretations Committee that under current legislation institutions are required to provide student-athletes with one day off per week even while the team is participating in NCAA championship competition.

The men's basketball committee supports the Interpretations Committee to eliminate the off day in championship competitions. I urge your support.

[Part A of Proposal No. 93 (page A-129) was adopted by Division I.]

Safety Exception—Wrestling

Robert Bowlsby (University of Iowa): I move Proposal No. 95.

[The motion was seconded.]

Regulations currently exist in Bylaw 17 that accommodate safety concerns in several sports. While one can debate the general advisability of the various safety exceptions, it seems appropriate that as long as the enabling legislation exists we should seek to ensure the safety in all sports where unsupervised student-athletes are at risk.

The sport of wrestling involves at least as much risk as some of those sports currently enjoying exceptions. It has been stated that adding safety exceptions in additional sports is simply a method for increasing practice time and student-athlete-coach interaction.

On the contrary, I would suggest to you that these voluntary workouts are currently taking place. Proposal No. 95 simply seeks to ensure that we provide a safe environment. I ask that the delegates approve the safety exception in wrestling and that we reevaluate the principles of Bylaw 17 so we can know that we have not left student-athletes at risk during our deliberations.

Irwin M. Cohen (Northeastern University): On behalf of the Council, I speak in opposition to this proposal.

More study is needed to determine whether the safety exceptions currently allowed are necessary as well as to determine whether any additional sport needs a safety exception to allow coaches to be present during voluntary workouts.

Peter Likins (Lehigh University): I rise in support of Proposal 95.

NCAA legislation is motivated by our experience in football and basketball. Team sports are strongly associated at the amateur level with schools and colleges. In this environment, we can easily lose sight of the fact that hundreds of thousands of amateur athletes compete very seriously in individual sports, often independently of the school and college they may attend. It pays off in competition, but many just train hard because they love their sport and they want to reach as high as they possibly can.

When these athletes go to college, they will train off season. We do not pretend that we have the authority in this Convention to rule otherwise. With or without supervision and with or without encouragement from their college coaches, some of them will practice their sport. The only issue for us to decide is the role that the NCAA will permit the college coach to play. For good reason, we have passed NCAA legislation limiting coaches in many sports from participating in off-season workouts. Frankly, we don't trust the coaches. We are afraid that off-season practice will become compulsory and burdening student-athletes unduly. For team sports, this is particularly likely, because the whole team must practice together to be effective. But for individual sports, that is not necessary.

In my experience, only a few student-athletes on a typical individual-sport team have the zeal for off-season workouts. The coaches seem content with such variability of behavior. So the question is, should we allow coaches to be present during voluntary off-season workouts in individual sports?

In our wisdom, we have done so for water polo, a team sport, and for five individual sports—fencing, gymnastics, rifle, skiing, swimming and diving, and track and field. We have not done so for wrestling, cross country, tennis and golf. Fair-minded people can disagree on this matter, but we should not be in disagreement when the issue is students' safety. We really must go for rules that reduce unnecessary risk of injury. If we use that logic for any sport, we must apply it to the sport of wrestling.

If you are not familiar with wrestling, and I expect that most of you are not, I urge you to review NCAA injury statistics to identify the most dangerous sports per hour of activity and to read the wrestling rules book. You will discover that wrestling is an inherently dangerous sport with a strong correlation between injury avoidance and professional supervision. You will discover that injuries are less likely in competition than in practice, because largely in competition two wrestlers are closely supervised by a referee who quickly intervenes in any situation that the rule book defines as potentially dangerous. If the referee is slow to recognize a potentially dangerous situation, there are at least two good coaches and sometimes also mat judges right there to call quick attention to the potentially dangerous situation. That is why a wrestling match is much less dangerous than a wrestling practice when there are many wrestlers who are going hard and the coaching staff is stretched to its limits. That is why we should vote to allow voluntary off-season workouts to be professionally supervised in the sport of wrestling.

We should remember Ced Dempsey's words on Sunday. He said: "Reform doesn't mean rigidity, and refinement does not mean retreat." We should vote "yes" on No. 95 as a refinement of our rules that are the theme of next year's Convention—student-athletes' welfare, access and equity. The health and safety of the student-athlete is the second of six principles that guide next year's agenda. I think

we should adopt that principle right now.

[Proposal No. 95 (page A-131) was defeated by Division I, 121-129, 58 abstentions.]

Length of Season—Divisions I and II Softball and Women's Volleyball

Kathleen J. DeBoer (University of Kentucky): On behalf of the American Volleyball Coaches Association and the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 97.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment is an attempt within the constraints and spirit of the Presidents Commission reform movement to increase the practice-time legislation to more appropriately accommodate the needs and interests of student-athletes and their coaches.

Our request is that volleyball and softball practice time allowed in a nontraditional season be reduced from 20 hours per week to 15 hours per week, and that the length of the total season be increased from 22 to 24 weeks. Currently, the nontraditional season is about six weeks long, which allows for 120 hours of allowable practice time. This reduction calls for 15 hours per week for eight weeks, which results in 120 hours of practice time. Objections to this amendment center on changing practice time in only two sports.

The volleyball coaches association surveyed all the other team sports and presented this legislation to them. Softball was the only other sport that had a problem with the nontraditional practice time. We assume that the sports that did not respond have a situation where they don't have a problem. So let's don't try to fix it for them.

The second objection is that we are reversing presidential reform by going from 22 to 24 weeks in these two sports. I reiterate that the practice time is less if your nontraditional season is longer than six weeks.

I repeat what Ced Dempsey said to us: "Reform does not mean rigidity, refinement does not mean retreat." This is in the best interest of our student-athletes and coaches. I urge your support.

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): On behalf of the Council, I speak in opposition to this proposal.

While it is true that the proposal reduces by five the number of hours a student-athlete can practice per week during the nontraditional segment, it also increases the number of weeks in softball and women's volleyball in their seasons from 22 to 24 weeks.

The Council believes that adding two weeks to the season, even with the reduction in hours during the nontraditional segment, is contrary to the reform movement related to time demands on student-athletes. I urge your negative vote.

Diane Milutinovich (California State University, Fresno): This allows volleyball and softball coaches and student-athletes in both of those sports more flexibility. It will allow coaches to give student-athletes time off during those other weeks for studies and time to themselves.

It is really sound legislation. It does not extend anything that the Presidents Commission doesn't want or give the coaches or players more time on the field. It provides for more flexibility that we think is sound for student-athletes.

[Proposal No. 97 (page A-134) was defeated by Division I.]

Weekly Hour Limitations—Softball and Women's Volleyball

Lisa Love (University of Southern California): On behalf of the American Volleyball Coaches Association, I move Proposal No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

This particular proposal addresses limitations during the non-playing season. Currently we are allowed to train eight hours a week, and it is largely limited to strength and conditioning. Although strength is critical in volleyball, this proposal reduces the hours from eight to six. Two of those six hours could be utilized for sports-specific training.

Not only does the proposal limit the hours of sports-specific training, it further limits the number of student-athletes who could be involved in any one teaching session to no more than three. The purpose of the proposal is to teach skills specific to the sport. It should not be misconstrued as a cloaked opportunity for team practice in the nonplaying season. Reducing training hours is not well received by the volleyball-coaching community. However, it is presented here in the spirit of compromise in an effort simply to teach skills.

I urge your very serious considerations and your adoption of Proposal No. 98 in the spirit for which it was proposed by the volleyball-coaching community.

[Proposal No. 98 (page A-135) was defeated by Division I.]

Division I Softball—National Invitational Championship

Helen Smiley (Western Illinois University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

The National Invitational Championship provides opportunities for 15 softball teams that are not selected to participate in the NCAA championships to participate in postseason competition.

Teams involved in this championship are not identified until the close of the regular season. Teams successful enough to be invited to the NIC have one week of practice time to prepare for the championship.

This proposal would specify that practice held in preparation for and participation in the National Invitational Championships is excluded from the maximum number of weeks and number of dates of competition in softball. I urge your support of Proposal No. 99.

Doris R. Soladay (Syracuse University): On behalf of the Council, I speak in support of the proposal.

It makes sense to exclude the National Invitation Softball Championship from the playing season and from the institution's maximum number of softball contests. We urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 99 (page A-136) was adopted by Division I.]

Volleyball—National Invitational Volleyball Championship

Bill Rowe (Southwest Missouri State University): On behalf of the sponsors and with the support of the Division I Steering Committee, I move Proposal No. 100.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 100 is a replay of the previous proposal that just passed. During the past five years, the National Invitation Volleyball Championship has provided opportunities for 20 women's volleyball teams to participate in postseason opportunity. The NIVC has given great encouragement to the development of the sport.

Under current rules, teams lose one week of subsequent practice opportunities for having the honor of participating. The passage of No. 100 will exempt the tournament from counting against a declared playing season. I urge your support.

Diane Milutinovich (California State University, Fresno): We believe that it makes sense to exclude the National Invitational Volleyball Championship from the institution's volleyball season.

[Proposal No. 100 (page A-138) was adopted by Division I.]

Contest Exemptions—Division I Women's Basketball

Margie McDonald (Western Athletic Conference): With the support of the Division I Steering Committee and the Women's Basketball Coaches Association, and on behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 104.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal exempts participation in the Women's Preseason National Invitation Tournament from counting in the maximum number of games allowed in a women's basketball season. It establishes dates for the tournament and sets participation limits for institutions and conferences. We believe the time is right for the women's preseason NIT, and urge your support of Proposal No. 104.

Irwin M. Cohen (Northeastern University): On behalf of the Council, I speak in support of this proposal.

As stated in the rationale statement for the proposal, Division I men's basketball has had a preseason NIT tournament for many years. It makes sense for women's basketball to have the same exceptional opportunities that men's basketball teams have. I urge your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 104 (page A-142) was adopted by Division I.]

Contest Exemptions—Division I Basketball

Charles Cavagnaro (Memphis State University): I move Proposal No. 105.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 105 comes with the endorsement and support of the Council and Division I Steering Committee. It is consistent with the approval granted to a member institution at last year's Convention.

Last year, the Convention also approved a proposal to return such competition to the Thanksgiving holiday period, which minimizes

the loss of class time and conflicts with finals. It will preserve conference and institutional scheduling practices and increase flexibility.

It will permit flexibility and improve the opportunity for the students to enjoy a competitive, educational experience. This has the support and endorsement of the Council and the Division I Steering Committee. I urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 105 (page A-143) was adopted by Division I.]

Contest Exemptions—Division I Basketball

Rudy Davalos (University of New Mexico): I move Proposal No. 106.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will enable the Great Alaska Shootout to continue to be a viable and important event in college basketball. The shootout has established a tradition of affording a cross section of NCAA member institutions and their student-athletes the unique experience of visiting Alaska and participating in this fine tournament.

The intent of this proposal is to allow institutions to exempt games played in the shootout once every 12 years. Further, it is intended that a minimum of one member from all recognized NCAA Division I basketball conferences will be invited to participate in the shootout over each 12-year period. This proposal is supported by the Division I Steering Committee. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 106 (page A-144) was adopted by Division I.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Golf

Ken Kraft (Northwestern University): I move Proposal No. 117.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal calls for golf to change the first date of practice in the nontraditional segment to September 7 or the first day of classes, whichever occurs earlier. Also, it would change the first day of competition to the first Saturday in September. It will allow Northern area teams to begin competition earlier and also put golf on the same start date as cross country, field hockey, soccer and water polo. The Divisions I and II Steering Committees voted to support this proposal. I urge you to vote "yes" on Proposal No. 117.

Mildred B. Griggs (University of Illinois, Champaign): On behalf of the Council, I speak in support of this proposal. It simply does justice for golf. The starting date for this is the same as cross country, field hockey, soccer and volleyball.

[Proposal No. 117 (page A-157) was adopted by Division I.]

Golf—College-Am Fund-Raiser

Ken Kraft (Northwestern University): I move Proposal No. 118.

[The motion was seconded.]

This will allow a "college-am" golf fund-raiser to be excluded from the three-day limitations if this is conducted the day before the three-day event. No practice round can be played before the day of the "college-am."

These "college-am" tournaments have great importance in fund-raising for golf events. "College-ams" must take the place of a practice round for the participants and no additional class time will be

missed. The Division I Steering Committee voted to support this proposal. I ask for your support of Proposal No. 118.

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee, I urge your support of this proposal. This is a sensible proposal, which facilitates fund-raising and goodwill for universities. There are no negative aspects to it. I urge your support.

John R. Means (Golf Coaches Association of America): I am president of the golf association. Proposal No. 118 excludes a "college-am" fund-raiser in the limitations if the event is held the day before a three-day tournament.

We are allowed a "college-am" fund-raiser for a three-day event. This forces many schools to have two-day tournaments instead of a three-day tournament, which add additional costs for travel to more tournaments. Currently, we are allowed 24 days of competition. This will be broken up to 12, three days or eight, two-day events. The three-day events are much less costly. This proposal does not cause any missed class time because they are at the "college-am." This proposal has the support of the steering committee. I urge your passage of this proposal.

James M. O'Fallon (University of Oregon): There is one aspect of this that I find quite problematic. We are enlisting student-athletes from other institutions to participate in the fund-raising activities of our institutions. I think that is inappropriate.

[Proposal No. 118 (page A-158) was adopted by Division I.]

Maximum Dates of Competition—Tennis

Kathy Clark (University of Idaho): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 119.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 119 is noncontroversial. It will simply make team tennis tournament limitations for the institution and the individual consistent with those currently in place for individual singles and double tournaments.

Team tennis is played under a mixed team format. A match consists of five no-add sets of 16 games each played on one or two courts. Playing involves one set each of men's singles, women's singles, men's doubles, women's doubles, and mixed doubles. The entire match can be played in as little as one to two hours and turns tennis into an exciting team event. Because mixed teams are involved, matches can only be used to meet men's scheduling requirements under current NCAA rules. So there is no negative impact on the women's program.

The sponsors of this legislation urge your approval of this house-keeping measure that will provide consistency for men's scheduling limitations.

[Parts A and B of Proposal No. 119 (page A-158) were adopted by Division I.]

Clearinghouse Fee—Nonrecruited Student-Athlete

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Football Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 128.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council and the initial-eligibility clearinghouse committee believe that the adoption of this legislation will expedite the processing of the initial-eligibility certification of nonrecruited student-athletes.

This legislation is permissive. It allows the institutions to pay the \$18 clearinghouse registration fee for the walk-on. Because this option is available only to enrolled student-athletes who are nonrecruited walk-ons, no recruiting advantages can be gained. I urge your support.

Karl P. Mooney (National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics): The National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics encourages the delegates to vote against this proposal. While this proposal appears to be generous in its willingness to pay for the student-athlete's NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse fee of \$18, the proposal is fraught with nightmares.

The first aspect of this proposal that causes concern is the identification of prospects who are recruited or not recruited. This nightmare is one that needs to be deregulated, not one that needs to be of increasing concerns. This proposal is unnecessary. The clearinghouse fee of \$18 can already be waived if the student has received a waiver of the ACT or SAT fee. The existing process is fair and does not involve subjective determination of qualifications for the fee waiver as this proposal promotes.

Finally, this proposal does not follow the concept of cost reduction presented by the Presidents Commission over the past several years. Therefore, I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 128.

[Proposal No. 128 (page A-166) was defeated by Division I.]

Complimentary Admissions

David V. Thompson (Atlantic Coast Conference): I move Proposal No. 129.

[The motion was seconded.]

Consistent with many, many other proposals before the Convention, this proposal attempts to deregulate and simplify. As almost any compliance coordinator can tell you, the amount of time and resources necessary to correctly administer, monitor and verify the procedures mandated by Bylaw 16.2.1.2 can best be described as an inordinate amount of work and at worst overwhelming and inappropriate.

For institutions that do spend more of their energies, it is not uncommon to discover that a student-athlete has identified the complimentary admission recipient as a family member or a relative when, in fact, they are not. While the provision of this incorrect information by the student-athlete does constitute a violation that must be reported to the enforcement staff and for which an institution may be penalized, interestingly, it does not require the student-athlete to be

declared ineligible. More importantly, the current procedures do not prevent student-athletes who are really interested in selling their complimentary admissions from doing so. The opportunity to receive cash or other items for complimentary tickets still exists.

Although I anticipate you will hear shortly from the esteemed commissioner of the Southeastern Conference and perhaps others that the selling of complimentary admissions has been reduced in the past several years, the sponsors believe this reduction primarily is attributable to the establishment of pass-list gate procedures. Please note that Proposal No. 129 does not eliminate this requirement.

Finally, at a meeting on Friday of the National Association of Athletics Compliance Coordinators, which is a group that probably deals with this on the most direct day-to-day basis, there was an 85-percent approval rate from that group. Although it doesn't appear in the Official Notice, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports this. I also urge your support.

Jerry L. Kingston (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I speak in opposition to this proposal. There was a reason for including the restriction. Not more than one student-athlete complimentary admissions can be used as a wild card. That was to help ensure that student-athletes were not selling their complimentary admissions to athletics representatives and others. The additional administrative burden created does not eliminate the need for the current rules. On behalf of the Council, I urge your defeat of this proposal.

Jeremy Foley (University of Florida): I rise in opposition to this proposal.

In all due respect to the sponsors, this will create a Pandora's box of problems. It will reopen the business of selling complimentary tickets. Having started out in this business as a ticket manager and having been at an institution that was involved in an infractions case involved in selling complimentary tickets, I will tell you this will put us back in that business. That is not good legislation.

Granted, what we have is currently an administrative headache. I don't think anyone can evade the hard work. I will tell you that we have not had an infractions case relating to selling complimentary tickets. Therefore, I urge your defeat of this proposal. This is not good legislation and puts us back after having made significant improvements over the past several years.

Barbara Winsett (University of Illinois, Champaign/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 129 because it allows the student-athlete the latitude to identify any individual that is important in their lives. Those special people are not always their biological relatives.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee feels that the current legislation is archaic. Today's student-athletes are from single-family homes, homes from several thousand miles away and from foreign countries. This is exhibited at the Honda Awards Banquet, as well as

with the several members of our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. The existing legislation puts the student-athlete in a compromising condition. We recognize and understand selling complimentary tickets for monetary gain is a problem. We don't believe changing the legislation to specify family members will change that current practice.

The Eligibility Committee has confirmed that selling complimentary admissions will still be considered a violation. The student-athlete's eligibility will be treated as such. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee believes it should remain the same.

Student-athletes simply want to name specific people who we believe need to be present at the competitions to share in their experience. We urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 129 (page A-166) was adopted by Division I.]

Transfer—Hearing Opportunity

Irwin M. Cohen (Northeastern University/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I am chair of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 133.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would be effective immediately and would require institutions to establish an appeal process for student-athletes when permission is denied to contact institutions about transferring or when the institution will not provide release for the one-time transfer exception. The Council is in support of this proposal because student-athletes often are denied releases to transfer for reasons that are not in the best interest of a student-athlete. Oftentimes, the student-athlete may be denied a release based on the recommendation of coaches who may decide to grant or deny the release for personal reasons.

This proposal would provide the student-athlete with a forum or hearing to be conducted by an institutional entity or committee outside of the athletics department, similar to the hearing required by student-athletes when financial aid is not renewed. This hearing opportunity is a way to make sure the best interest of the student-athlete is served. On behalf of the Council and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I encourage you to adopt this proposal.

Walter B. Newsom (Mississippi State University): On behalf of the Southeastern Conference's student-athlete advisory committee, I urge your support of this proposal.

The committee unanimously agreed that in cases where student-athletes are denied permission to contact an institution about transferring, or when an institution will not provide certification for the one-time transfer exception, an institutional appeals process should be in place for student-athletes.

Thus, on behalf of the Southeastern Conference's student-athlete advisory committee, I urge your support of this proposal.

Tanya Yvette Hughes (University of Arizona/Student-Athlete

Advisory Committee): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly supports this proposal. Every decision you make is not always a good one. Circumstances change and a person should be allowed to arrive at a different decision. This proposal will give student-athletes due process when their request for transfer is denied. The student-athlete may want to transfer for many reasons. For example, their relationship with coaches may not be a productive one. There are instances where the coach's personal feelings warrant a recommendation to grant a release. This proposal would provide a forum outside the athletics department where both parties can be heard. Such a hearing would be in the best interest of the student-athletes and the institution.

Executive Director Dempsey spoke of the four Rs—reform, refinement, restructuring and respect. Not only will the approval of this proposal refine the relationship between the student-athletes and the institution, it is consistent with current reform measures. As Dr. Dempsey stated, refine does not mean retreat. Let us charge forward and approve Proposal No. 133.

[Proposal No. 133 (page A-169) was adopted by Division I.]

Reconsideration of Safety Exception—Wrestling

Max F. Urick (Kansas State University): Having voted on the prevailing side of Proposal No. 95, I move reconsideration of Proposal No. 95.

[The motion was seconded.]

Robert Bowlsby (University of Iowa): As chair of the NCAA Wrestling Committee, I rise once again to encourage your support of this proposal.

We have adopted legislation in past years that provides the opportunity for a fairly substantial restriction on the amount of time that student-athletes spend in formal practice activities. In conjunction with this, we have sanctioned either directly or indirectly the inclusion of voluntary workouts in the student-athlete's daily lifestyle. That being the case, and in those sports where it seems appropriate, we have also provided the opportunity for a safety exemption that will ensure an environment that is conducive to not only the rigors of training but also the safest possible environment.

In keeping with that philosophy, it is hard for me to imagine that wrestling should not be given the same consideration. I certainly don't intend to belabor the point or drag out these proceedings but I ask your reconsideration of this topic. We have student-athletes who are in jeopardy. As we look at the overall philosophy of the safety exception, I have to admit I have not been universally in favor of it. But in this case, I firmly believe that we have young people who are in some jeopardy of injury.

As President Likins from Lehigh noted earlier, wrestlers, and the sport of wrestling, are at the top of the injury surveillance data that the NCAA compiles. I ask your consideration of a favorable vote on this proposal.

Peter Likins (Lehigh University): We apologize for testing the patience of this assembly. We were within a few votes of success when No. 95 was considered a short time ago. There were 58 abstentions. I think many of those abstentions were motivated by our realization that this peculiar sport of wrestling is not known to all. Its inherent propensity for injury is not something that everybody can identify with.

A number of those who abstained have agreed to give the matter further consideration. We would put on a demonstration for you, but this would be an inappropriate arena. I am afraid that won't work. Please, please, trust us and allow us to pass this protective legislation.

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): President Likins has urged those who abstained to take another look at it. I think that is a good idea. For schools that have wrestling programs, I do think this is very important legislation. My inclination is that people who have wrestling programs probably voted "yes" on the proposal. Maybe some of the abstentions came from schools that didn't have programs. Maybe some of the "no" votes came from schools that didn't have wrestling programs.

If you voted "no" and don't have a wrestling program, I urge you to abstain.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 95 (page A-131) was approved by Division I.]

[Proposal No. 95 (page A-131) was adopted upon reconsideration by Division I.]

Recruiting—Evaluations

William T. "Todd" Turner (North Carolina State University): On behalf of the members of the Atlantic Coast Conference, I move Proposal No. 134.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal attempts to simplify and standardize the definition of evaluation. Currently, in an individual sport a coach is required to count an evaluation for all prospects competing on a day in which a coach has attended a competition.

A coach who arrives at a track meet at one in the afternoon, evaluates the prospects for an hour and departs at 2 p.m. is deemed to have evaluated all prospects who competed any time during that calendar day in that fragment.

The current regulations should be changed. There is no reasonable method for a coach to report evaluation of prospects that he or she never observed. Proposal No. 134 provides a reasonable solution that parallels the definition of evaluation of prospects in team sports. It simply states that in order for an evaluation of a prospect to occur in a competition setting, the coach must actually have observed the prospect in that practice or competition. Proposal No. 134 is a small but important step to help make the monitoring of recruiting more reasonable, manageable and enforceable.

As indicated in your Official Notice, the Recruiting Committee has indicated its support for this proposal. I also urge your support.

[Proposal No. 134 (page A-170) was adopted by Division I.]

Recruiting—Telephone Calls—Division I

Elizabeth Fahey Allbright (Pennsylvania State University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 140.

[The motion was seconded.]

We do permit a 1-800 number in the admissions offices and other places on campus. It seems reasonable to permit a toll-free number if a school so chooses in its athletics department.

[Proposal No. 140 (page A-176) was adopted by Division I other than I-A.]

Recruiting—Automobile Transportation

Vincent J. Dooley (University of Georgia): On behalf of the Council and as a member of the Recruiting Committee, I move Proposal No. 141.

[The motion was seconded.]

We believe it is unreasonable to require an institution to count an official visit for each prospect in an automobile even if the institution is not recruiting the other individuals.

For example, if a prospect's brother is a sophomore high-school student-athlete and accompanies a prospect on his visits, the institution could not reimburse the prospect being recruited for his automobile transportation because the current legislation would require the institution to count the brother's visit as an official visit.

This proposal would specify that the visit would count as an official visit only for the prospect being recruited. I urge you to vote in support of Proposal No. 141.

[Proposal No. 141 (page A-177) was adopted by Division I.]

Unofficial Visit—Parking

Charles W. Ehrhardt (Florida State University): On behalf of the members of the Atlantic Coast Conference, I move Proposal No. 143.

[The motion was seconded.]

Special parking for prospects on an unofficial university visit is consistent with the provisions of three complimentary admissions. It is a courtesy that can be provided with little or no cost to the institution. As indicated in the program, the Recruiting Committee has voted to support this proposal. I also urge your support.

Jerry L. Kingston (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the NCAA Council, I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 143. In the view of the Council, this proposal would create yet another arms race.

If one institution provides special parking, all or many of them are going to be forced to do so. Restrictions on the amount of benefits a prospect may receive on an unofficial visit are there for a specific reason—to avoid the competitiveness and the types of problems that can be created.

Current benefits include three complimentary tickets and transportation to a campus site. No other benefits are needed or desirable.

260 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

On behalf of the Council, I urge your defeat of Proposal No. 143.

[Proposal No. 143 (page A-179) was defeated by Division I.]

Recruiting—Gifts at Coaches' Clinics

Charles W. Ehrhardt (Florida State University): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 145.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal No. 145 is to prohibit high-school, college preparatory and two-year college coaches from receiving prizes in conjunction with an institution's coaches' clinic, including prizes donated by outside sponsors.

Much concern has been expressed that under the current rule, many institutions are soliciting door prizes from outside sponsors in conjunction with their coaching clinics. Because some of the prizes are of considerable value, the motive behind these prizes may relate to the recruitment of the coaches' prospects and could result in an institution receiving an improper recruiting advantage.

The intent of the institutional coaching clinic is to provide appropriate instruction to the participants. The college coaches related to the sport are not to be used in the form of recruitment of prospects. The prohibition against receiving any prizes in connection with such clinics will create a mood to level the playing field and protect against any eventual abuse of the purpose of the educational clinics. I urge you to support Proposal No. 145.

[Proposal No. 145 (page A-180) was adopted by Division I.]

Summer Basketball Event Certification

Vincent J. Dooley (University of Georgia): On behalf of the Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move Proposal No. 146.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of 1993 Convention Proposal No. 127, as amended by Proposal No. 127-1, permits Division I basketball coaching staff members during the July evaluation period to attend only institutional camps per Bylaw 13.13.1 and noninstitutional camps that are certified by the NCAA.

The Council and Recruiting Committee believe that the summer basketball camp certification program should be broadened to include all noninstitutional basketball events such as camps, leagues, tournaments and festivals in order to eliminate the current practice of changing the format of the camp or activity to circumvent the current legislation.

During the past summer, the initial year for the summer basketball camp certification program, many camps eliminated their on- and off-court instructional elements and other noncompetitive activities in order to avoid being classified as a noninstitutional camp, which would require the camp to be certified. As a result, those noninstitutional camps circumvent current legislation. This proposal, if adopted, would require that all noninstitutional basketball events conducted during the July evaluation period be certified in accordance with the NCAA summer basketball camp certification pro-

Division I Business Session _____ 261

gram, which is consistent with the Recruiting Committee's original intent of the certification program. I urge you to vote in support of Proposal No. 146.

[Proposal No. 146 (page A-180) was adopted by Division I.]

Recruitment

David Price (Pacific-10 Conference): On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee and the Council, I move Proposal No. 162.

[The motion was seconded.]

This item is the first in a series of proposals that sets forth the Legislative Review Committee's modest efforts to deregulate and simplify recruiting rules. It represents our first efforts in this area. We are proposing baby steps, not giant leaps. Proposal No. 162 is an attempt to simplify the definition of a recruited prospective student-athlete. It reduces the number of activities that constitute recruitment to three. It makes it far easier for an institution to identify whether a prospect is being recruited. We hope that you agree that it represents an improved and simplified rule. We urge your support for Proposal No. 162.

[Proposal No. 162 (page A-199) was adopted by Division I.]

One-Visit-Per-Week Limit on Visits to Prospect's High School—Sports Other than Football and Basketball

Melissa L. Conboy (University of Notre Dame): On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee and the Council, I move Proposal No. 163.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is a part of the Legislative Review Committee's efforts to deregulate and simplify Bylaw 13. This proposal would eliminate in sports other than football and basketball the current restriction that keeps the coach from visiting a prospect's high school on more than one occasion during a particular week.

The current legislation was an attempt to give prospective student-athletes some relief from the constant pressures of recruitment. However, while most of the documented abuse was in the sports of football and basketball, the legislation aimed at curbing those abuses was in the appropriate bylaws.

Coaches frequently run into situations where it will be much more cost effective when they are permitted to make multiple contacts and evaluations during a single trip to a prospect's hometown. However, because of the restrictions on the weekly number of high-school visits, these college coaches are unable to make the best use of their dollars.

This proposal would reinstate it for all sports other than football and basketball. We ask you to give consideration to simplifying this part of the recruiting legislation by adopting Proposal No. 163.

[Proposal No. 163 (page A-201) was adopted by Division I.]

Reconsideration of Complimentary Admissions

Walter B. Newsom (Mississippi State University): As a member of a school that voted on the prevailing side on Proposal No. 129, we move that the proposal be reconsidered.

R. Gerald Turner (University of Mississippi): I understand the problem that there is in identifying relatives and those who claim to be cousins, aunts, uncles, for complimentary passes. No. 129 would allow those who want to provide support to a student-athlete to simply purchase one of those passes for the year.

He would be named on that list. This, of course, would not be "up-front" by any means. We have worked very hard in earlier reform efforts to try to remove that particular problem from our midst. This would simply reimplement it in another form. I urge the membership to vote down No. 129.

Unidentifiable Delegate: Complimentary passes are for family members or people who are most important to a student-athlete's life.

They are for the people who the student-athletes want to be there for their experience. In today's mobile society, student-athletes have others outside of nearby relatives who are most important to their lives.

Roy Kramer (Southeastern Conference): While this rule has at times caused all of us some consternation—I am sure it is not a favorite of our ticket managers—it has significantly reduced the difficulties with complimentary admissions.

I can speak firsthand to tell you that since the passage of this legislation, we have not had a major case with regard to infractions that incorporated the purchase of player tickets for extra benefits. Before this, it was a part of almost every major case that came before the Infractions Committee. It is cumbersome in some respects, but it addresses a major issue with the integrity of intercollegiate athletics. It should remain as it is. If we reconsider this piece of legislation, it opens the way for the sale of admissions to a conference basketball tournament, which is one of the major areas of concern of this piece of legislation.

I would strongly urge the membership to seriously consider going back and voting on this major piece of legislation. At best, allow Division I-A, where there is a significant issue of enforcement, to have the opportunity to maintain this piece of legislation. To go away from this will cause an enormous number of problems.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): Roy Kramer has said it very well. We would urge reconsideration of this proposal and when reconsidered urge that it be defeated. I speak not for the Presidents Commission. We have not met on the issue. But it is very consistent with the reform movement that this legislation be defeated.

David V. Thompson (Atlantic Coast Conference): Keep in mind that this in no way prohibits or prevents student-athletes from selling their complimentary tickets. What makes it a little more difficult is the fact that it may have reduced the number of cases that the Infractions Committee has heard.

As a practical matter, it becomes slightly more difficult for student-athletes to sell their complimentary admissions. In our case

with the ACC basketball tournament, a fellow student-athlete will gladly pay above face value of the ticket to go to our tournament. I urge your support to reconsider this proposal. If we do, support it.

R. Dale Smith (Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference): I would simply ask the sponsors to define if in the proposal there is provision for a complimentary admissions list will be required to be maintained. Will there be any list that you can give to anyone?

Mr. Thompson: We had not really thought through that completely. My personal opinion is that there should be a list. The legislation doesn't eliminate the reference in the bylaw to the pass list or the pass-list gate procedure. It simply eliminates that portion of the rule that says who the student can and cannot give tickets to. I would personally support a position by the legislative services staff to pass this today and to put a procedure in place so that you do have a record of who the student-athletes are providing these admissions to. If need be, go talk to those folks about how that arrangement came about.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 129 (page A-166) was defeated by Division I, 156-167, four abstentions.]

Contact With Parents at Site of Competition

David Price (Pacific-10 Conference): On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 165.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 165 eliminates the restriction against contacting a prospect's parents on the day of competition. As noted in the rationale statement, parents of prospects often seek out coaching staff members at the competition site, which creates an awkward and potential violation for the coach.

Contact with the parents does nothing to interfere with the prospect's preparation for the event, which is the main purpose for the original legislation. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 165 (page A-205) was adopted by Division I.]

Permissible Recruiters

Melissa L. Conboy (University of Notre Dame): On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 166.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal simply eliminates from the Manual the listing of certain examples of unavoidable incidental contact between an athletics representative and a prospect. This proposal does not change the application of the rule but simply clears up a very messy section of the Manual, which lists four specific examples of unavoidable or incidental contact when one of those specific scenarios occur.

We believe that it is better to state the definition of unavoidable incidental contact than to allow the institutions to apply that definition to any specific situation that they encounter. I would ask you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 166 (page A-206) was adopted by Division I.]

Visits—Participation by Prospect in Recreational Activities

David Price (Pacific-10 Conference): On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee and the Council, I move Proposal No. 167.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal recognizes the desire of prospects who are highly skilled athletes to continue their daily workouts during the visit to the campus. The proposal eliminates the prohibition against the prospect engaging in recreational activities in any sport for which he or she is being recruited. He retains the safeguards with the activities that may not be organized or observed by members of the coaching staff and they may not be designed to test the athletics abilities of the prospect.

[Proposal No. 167 (page A-207) was adopted by Division I.]

Telephone Calls

James McCloskey (University of Florida): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 168 on behalf of the Council and the Legislative Review Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is part of the series of recommendations from the Legislative Review Committee as a result of its analysis of Bylaw 13 for identifying areas in which rules could be eliminated or simplified.

The committee concluded that the restriction on telephone calls to prospective student-athletes was largely concerned with abuses in the sports of football and basketball. In those sports, experience has shown that numerous calls that are both expensive and disruptive to prospects are likely. In reviewing other sports, the committee concluded that such abuses are far less likely to occur and the regulation of telephone calls that are necessary to ensure compliance may be unwarranted. Accordingly, the committee recommended and the Council agreed, to sponsor legislation to leave in place the restriction prohibiting telephone calls to prospects until July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school, but to eliminate other restrictions on the number and frequency of telephone calls to prospects in sports other than football and basketball. I urge your support of this legislation.

Calvin Bowers (Bowling Green State University/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is in opposition to Proposal No. 168. We feel that the pressures present in the recruiting of prospective student-athletes in football and basketball are also present in the recruiting of nonrevenue sports athletes. For example, ice hockey in the Northeast, volleyball in the West and even baseball in selected parts of the country are considered major sports at many institutions and involve heavy recruiting, very much like football and basketball.

All prospective student-athletes in these sports deserve the same safeguards as those given to prospective student-athletes in football and basketball. There is tremendous pressure and strain on high-

school student-athletes to make their decision for college. Adding to that pressure are numerous phone calls coming from coaches. Any student-athlete who is heavily recruited for a prospective sport already has some idea of where they want to attend. An additional phone call does not accomplish anything, other than allowing another contact.

Not only do we not need the additional calls, we don't want them. We urge you to oppose this proposal.

[Proposal No. 168 (page A-207) was defeated by Division I.]

Travel to Official Visit—Reimbursement

Melissa L. Conboy (University of Notre Dame): On behalf of the Council and Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 169.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is another attempt by the Legislative Review Committee to identify those rules that could be eliminated or simplified. Please note that the Convention Program contains the corrections to this proposal. It notes that Bylaw 13.6.2.2.1 is not defeated by the legislation.

In recommending this proposal, the Legislative Review Committee believes that it is appropriate to consider the prohibition against an institution's athletics representative from providing transportation to a prospect on an official visit. However, the committee concluded that other friends or family members should be permitted to provide transportation to a prospect and to be reimbursed by the institution for the actual mileage incurred at the same rate that the institution allows for its own employees.

It appears that this modification of the current legislation would be reasonable, yet not open the door for abuse. Please note that current legislation allows for reimbursement of travel expenses only if the prospect or the prospect's parent or legal guardian provides the transportation. We urge your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 169 (page A-208) was adopted by Division I.]

Publicity

James McCloskey (University of Florida): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 170 on behalf of the Council and the Legislative Review Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is another result of the Legislative Review Committee's review of the Association's recruitment legislation for identifying rules that can be eliminated or simplified.

The committee concluded that the extensive restrictions from recruiting publicity were larger results of concerns about abuses in recruiting in the sports of football and basketball. The committee received observations from some coaching associations that those sports were eager for any publicity they could receive and were not concerned about publicity manipulating the recruiting process. Accordingly, the committee recommended and the Council agreed to sponsor legislation

to delete restrictions on recruiting publicity in all sports other than football and basketball. I urge your support of this legislation.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (The Ivy Group): Is there an opinion from the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee on this proposal?

Masa Oreskovic (Valdosta State University/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): We decided not to take a stand on this particular issue.

Mr. Orleans: Whatever publicity might be gotten from recruiting is at the expense of the prospective student-athlete. It could well be in a sport where there is already an intent to recruit and is precisely the kinds of pressures we found and prohibited in football and basketball. I urge this body to defeat this proposal.

[Proposal No. 170 (page A-209) was defeated by Division I.]

Camps and Clinics—Senior Prospect Prohibition

Melissa L. Conboy (University of Notre Dame): On behalf of the Council and Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 171.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Legislative Review Committee and the Council believe that it is no longer necessary to restrict the attendance of senior prospects in regular sports camps or clinics. By the time such camps are generally conducted, highly recruited prospects have already made their commitment to specific member institutions. Recent high-school graduates who would like to attend a sports camp for recreational opportunity or a chance to improve their skills should have the opportunity to do so. If signed prospects choose to attend an institutional camp, they would have to pay the entire fee listed for camp participation.

This proposal also eliminates the prohibition against the employment of students who are not high-school, prep school or two-year college athletics award winners. The provisions of Bylaw 13.13.1.5, which prohibits offering free or reduced admissions to prospects, will continue in effect to provide protection against recruiting abuses. We urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 171 (page A-212) was adopted by Division I.]

Ms. Dreidame: I would like to take this opportunity to elect our officers and Council members for next year.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

[Note: The slate for Division I representatives to the Council was presented and approved.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Camps and Clinics—Employment of Student-Athletes

James McCloskey (University of Florida): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 172 on behalf of the Council and the Legislative Review Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is another result of the Legislative Review Committee's efforts to identify provisions of Bylaw 13 that can be eliminated or simplified. The committee noted that current legislation restricts Division I football, basketball and soccer student-athletes' employment in camps and clinics. This limits opportunities for student-athletes and requires careful tracking by a member institution to avoid violations. The committee believes that the regulations currently in effect in Divisions II and III that generally permit the employment of student-athletes as counselors at camps and clinics are more reasonable.

As noted in the rationale, the legislation contains a prohibition against participating in organized practice activities outside the institution's playing season in the student-athlete's sport. It also requires approval by the institution's director of athletics for such employment.

These restrictions should be adequate safeguards against the potential for abuse that led to the current Division I rules. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 172 (page A-213) was adopted by Division I.]

Camps and Clinics—Employment of High-School Coaches

James McCloskey (University of Florida): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 173 on behalf of the Council and the Legislative Review Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is the final result of the Legislative Review Committee's attempt to identify recruiting regulations that can be eliminated or simplified. The committee believes that adoption of this legislation will simplify Bylaw 13.13.2.2.2 in that it would clarify regulations concerning employment of a high-school, preparatory school or a two-year college coach at the camp of a member institution.

It imposes the same restrictions for all divisions. In subparagraphs A and B of Bylaw 13.13.2.2.2, it sets forth two critical tests of such employment. Specifically, coaches must receive compensation at a rate that is commensurate with the going rate for camp counselors with like teaching ability and camping experiences. The coach may not be paid on the basis of the value the coach may have for the employer because of the coach's reputation or contact with prospective student-athletes. The language being deleted does not contain any additional restrictions. I urge your support of this legislation.

[Parts A and B of Proposal No. 173 (page A-214) were adopted by Division I.]

[The Division I business session was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.]

NCAA Honors Dinner

Sunday Evening, January 9, 1994

WELCOME

President Crowley: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. It is my pleasure to welcome you to the Association's 29th annual honors program. I would ask you at this time to please rise for the invocation. It will be presented by Claire Gaudiani, president of Connecticut College, a member of the NCAA Presidents Commission and chair of Division III of that Commission.

INVOCATION

Claire L. Gaudiani (Connecticut College): Let us pray.

Tender, powerful God, tonight we gather together to honor gifted colleagues and to celebrate your gift of collegiate sports. We are grateful for Dick Schultz, Ced Dempsey and each honoree. Bless them in all they do. We are grateful for the virtues of self-discipline, patience and fairness that sports builds in the human spirit. We are grateful for food and fellowship tonight as we humbly remember our connection to brothers and sisters around the world and across human history, especially those who play sports and who know as we do the joys and challenges the human mind and body are capable of in athletics.

For all these things, we are grateful. Amen.

INTRODUCTIONS

President Crowley: I wonder if I might have your attention. I know some of you might not have completed your meal, but we have a long agenda and a relatively short time to complete it. Please continue with your meal. I will make some preliminary remarks and introductions. Then we will get to the heart of our program—the introduction of our honored guests.

I have had the opportunity to represent this Association on a number of occasions and in a variety of environments during the past year while serving as your president. I can say none of those occasions has provided me more individual pleasure than my participation in the honors dinner tonight. This dinner every year permits us to reflect on the positive values of intercollegiate athletics within the missions of higher education that have been established on each of our campuses. We take great pride, as we should, that our student-athletes often meet much higher standards to participate in our ath-

269

letics programs than do their peers in other extracurricular activities administered on our campuses.

The individuals we honor tonight represent the very best products of intercollegiate athletics programs. Speaking for all of you, we salute their accomplishments. We also take tremendous pride in the successes of current and former student-athletes from all of our institutions who have gone on to become role models and just plain good citizens. These successes provide us the encouragement and the will to continue our quest to create the best possible athletics opportunities for student-athletes in generations to come.

The individuals we salute tonight are representative of the many men and women who annually combine intellectual and physical abilities to epitomize the student-athlete concept that we value and that many of us have attempted to nurture on our respective campuses.

SPECIAL RECOGNITION

Mr. Crowley: At this time, I would like us to recognize the contributions of a very special member of the community of intercollegiate athletics. A graduate of Central College in Iowa, where he was a three-sport athlete—so you know it was a while ago that he graduated—he competed in football, basketball and baseball. He was a coach and administrator at the University of Iowa, Cornell University and the University of Virginia. For the last 6½ years he has been our Association's chief executive officer, an outstanding leader, a major force for positive change in intercollegiate athletics.

On behalf of the Association and on behalf of all of you here tonight, I am pleased to present an expression of our appreciation to our former executive director and good friend to all of us, Dick Schultz. (Applause)

Richard D. Schultz: Thank you, Joe, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I really appreciate being recognized. I appreciate all the wonderful things that have happened in this last 6½ years. Joe has asked me to make a few comments about the highlights of those last 6½ years. I will do that very briefly because we have more important things to get to on the agenda this evening.

If you talk about highlights, it probably depends upon the perspective that you have. Some would say the major highlight was the re-doing and simplification of the Manual, eliminating some rules that were discriminatory and that perhaps created more fairness for the Association. Some would say that it was the new model for intercollegiate athletics and the reform movement, the strengthening of the Presidents Commission, certification, negotiation of a billion-dollar contract, and probably some other things.

But as I reflect on it, the most important thing that happened in those 6½ years was really reflected in a series of polls that Lou Harris did over the last three years. Mr. Harris polled six different populations, including presidents, athletics directors, faculty representa-

tives, coaches, the general public and the media, as to their perception of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Interestingly enough, in the first poll, only one of those groups reflected positively on the Association. About 14 months later, a second poll was conducted and three of those populations viewed the NCAA in a positive manner. Last spring, the final poll was conducted and announced. All six of those populations viewed the NCAA and its contribution to intercollegiate athletics in a positive light.

I think that it is the type of change and the type of perspective that we all hope for. To me, I think that reflects all the things that we have worked together to accomplish in these last six years.

Let me just conclude by offering some thanks to the Executive Committee, the Presidents Commission and the Council for their dedication and support that they have given me and all the challenges that we have met and worked together over that period of time; to my God who gave me strength and encouragement and helped me overcome a lot of weaknesses; to my partner of nearly 45 years, Jackie, who was always there and enjoyed the excitement of the great accomplishments and the agony of the great disappointments; and especially to you people, the Association, our member institutions. I really appreciate the support that you gave me, the words of encouragement along the way. I will never forget that.

If I can close with something that I said in my State of the Association address last year: "When this is all over, if you can't say something else, I hope you will be able to say he made a difference."

Thank you and good luck to all of you. (Applause)

SPECIAL INTRODUCTIONS

President Crowley: Thanks, Dick. At this time, I would like to introduce some individuals who are sharing the platform this evening who will not be specifically acknowledged later in the program. Starting with the chair of the NCAA Honors Committee, which is responsible for selecting our honorees and planning our program. A man of many talents—we learned among them last year was an ability to step in at the last minute and do a brilliant job of serving as our master of ceremonies when Bernard Shaw was called upon to cover a war—Jack Davis. He is a former NCAA President from Oregon State University. Jack. (Applause)

If the Association had saluted the Top Six when this individual was a student-athlete at the University of Oklahoma, there is every reason to believe that he would have been an honoree since he was an all-Big Eight Conference running back as a junior as well as when he was a senior. He was also an academic all-American. He is our new secretary-treasurer. He has represented intercollegiate athletics with class and skill for many years as the associate commissioner of the Big Eight Conference. It is my pleasure to have him with us tonight—Mr. Prentice Gautt, associate commissioner of the Big Eight Conference and secretary-treasurer of the NCAA. (Applause)

This gentleman we met earlier in our business session, but I think it would be appropriate to note his presence again. This evening, it gives me a good feeling and pride to have the opportunity to present to you the new executive director of the NCAA who told us today about 40 years, four days, three Rs—Ced Dempsey. (Applause)

INTRODUCTION OF MASTER OF CEREMONIES

President Crowley: Our master of ceremonies this evening has one of the most pleasant and most recognizable voices in this country. His wit, wisdom and talent have earned him a spot in the National Association Broadcasters Hall of Fame.

Charles Osgood is recognized as one of the greatest writers ever to grace the airwaves. Since joining CBS News in September 1971, his news commentaries have won him legions of listeners. He anchors and writes "The Osgood File," four daily commentaries on the CBS Radio Network in which he shares his own sense of wonder, dismay or amusement with events of the day. On the CBS television network, Charles provides commentary for "CBS This Morning" and is a contributor to "CBS News Sunday Morning" and "Up to the Minute." Previously, he was a coanchor of the "CBS Morning News" and a frequent contributor to the "CBS Evening News with Dan Rather."

Charles earned his undergraduate degree in economics from Fordham University in New York, and several NCAA members have bestowed honorary degrees upon him. He currently serves on the board of trustees at Fordham and St. Bonaventure University. He is also a trustee of a music school in New York University, although he says they never would have made him a trustee had they first heard him perform. But we have reason to doubt that since he did play the piano with the New York Pops at Carnegie Hall for the orchestra's seventh anniversary gala.

It is my pleasure, ladies and gentlemen, to introduce our master of ceremonies this evening, a two-time winner of the George Foster Peabody Award, Charles Osgood of CBS Radio. (Applause)

COLLEGE ATHLETICS TOP XII

Charles Osgood: Thank you very much, Joe. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am more than honored and happy to be with you tonight. I am thrilled to be in the same room with some of the great people who are in our company tonight. We are here to celebrate one of our nation's truest treasures—intercollegiate athletics.

One of the benefits of sitting in my chair every morning is my "up-close," daily exposure to events that shape our world and our nation. Athletics, of course, continually generates news and is the basis for much of this nation's social conversation. I think what is important is not so much the conversation as the inspiration. Here are living examples of excellence, not only of marvelous physical skills but also mind and spirit, intellect and character, the will and determination to hone those skills to compete with the best and to achieve great

things. These are the qualities that America needs in these times of change and challenge.

There is another thing about your organization that strikes me that I am not sure most people are aware of. I see the NCAA as a progressive organization that often confronts societal problems long before they become prevalent in the public or private sectors of business or government. I congratulate you on your foresight in areas such as drug testing; AIDS prevention and protection; academic integrity, and enforcement of rules. Athletics confronts problems similar to those that are prevalent for all of our society. Intercollegiate athletics, although often criticized, more often than not provides sound leadership in addressing these issues.

We are not perfect and we have a long way to go, but then nobody is perfect. These people who are with us tonight are living proof that we have done a fine job. Let's get moving with the program. I have been afforded a sneak preview of tonight's events. I can report to you that you are in for an exciting evening. Let us meet those who you have honored and enjoy their successes and reflect upon the values of one of our nation's great treasures—the intercollegiate athletics programs of our colleges and universities.

At this time, I would direct your attention to your program to review the lists of student-athletes who have been named Walter Byers Scholars and those who have received NCAA postgraduate scholarships during the past year. The NCAA postgraduate scholarship program began in 1964. Since that time, the Association has invested more than \$4 million in postgraduate scholarships to more than 2,300 student-athletes. We congratulate each of these outstanding student-athletes and the institutions that they represent.

The College Athletics Top XII permits the Association to honor six outstanding student-athletes from the preceding year and six former letter-winners who have distinguished themselves in their chosen profession on their silver anniversary as college graduates. Now, I take great pleasure in introducing the top student-athletes to you.

TODAY'S TOP SIX

Trev Alberts, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Football.

Four years ago, he shuddered when the realization hit home that he was a scholarship football player at Nebraska. Four years later, Husker coaches are doing the shuddering at the thought of Nebraska football without Trev Alberts.

Trev obviously conquered his fears quickly. He was named the Big Eight defensive freshman of the year in 1990. Tonight he stands before you a consensus all-American and the winner of this year's Butkus Award as college football's best linebacker.

Trev consistently saves his best games for the toughest opponents. A year ago he had 14 tackles against Florida State in the Orange Bowl. In the long, glorious history of Nebraska football, no one has

recorded more quarterback sacks than Trev Alberts. He also is among Nebraska's leaders in career tackles and has corralled opposing ball-carriers for more than 200 yards in losses.

Trev was named this year to the Big Eight all-academic team, and is a three-time recipient of Nebraska's High Honors Academic Medallion. A two-time academic all-American, Trev graduated last August with a 3.3 grade-point average in communication studies. He has been awarded postgraduate scholarships from both the NCAA and the National Football Foundation Hall of Fame.

Trev is a frequent speaker to youth and high-school groups. He was the kickoff spokesman for the 1993 National American Education Week. He also speaks often to high-school students about the importance of maintaining and continuing their education.

Trev will receive his award from Bill Byrne, athletics director at Nebraska.

Ken Alexander, Florida State University, Football.

We've all known or heard of someone being "on a mission." Few student-athletes have ever matched that description more than our next honoree.

The 1993 Florida State team captain and defensive signal-caller, Ken Alexander led the team in tackles to help keep the Seminoles at or near the top of the polls all year. In his career, Ken contributed to some 250 tackles, and was a major reason why Florida State's defense was among the nation's best for the past four years.

An outstanding linebacker, Ken earned all-American honors this year and was a finalist for the Butkus Award won by our first honoree.

But statistics don't tell half the story of this student-athlete. The academic all-American raced to his bachelor of science degree in communications in 3½ years. He recorded a 3.57 grade-point average in his major, sometimes tackling more than 20 credit hours in a semester. He was named the outstanding student in Florida State's College of Communications and is on track to earn a master's in communications in May.

Last March, in his first attempt, Ken and Seminole teammate Kevin Knox advanced to the semifinals of a regional university debate tournament. A two-time Rhodes scholar finalist, Ken has been awarded postgraduate scholarships by the NCAA and the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame.

Ken has been a speaker in Florida State's "Say No to Drugs" program. He created a similar program in his hometown of Austin, Texas.

Ken will receive his award from Bob Goin, athletics director at Florida State.

Christie Allen, Pittsburg State University, Cross Country and Track and Field.

No female student-athlete has dominated the sports of cross country and track and field on the Division II level as has Christie Allen.

Christie won a total of eight NCAA individual championships in her last two years of competition. No other female Division II runner has accomplished that feat. She became the first woman in Division II history to claim the distance-running triple crown twice by winning national titles in the cross country and indoor and outdoor track seasons in both 1991-92 and 1992-93.

Consider what she accomplished as a junior and a senior. She won back-to-back titles in cross country and consecutive championships in the outdoor 10,000- and 5,000-meter runs. She then won the indoor 3,000- and 1,500-meters as a senior. Christie set seven school records and won 14 conference championships.

What else is there? Well, in her senior year against primarily Division I competition, she stepped up and won the 5,000-meter run at the Kansas Relays and the 10,000-meter run at the Texas Relays.

In the classroom, Christie posted a near-perfect 3.95 grade-point average—that's two career Bs—majoring in elementary education. A two-time academic all-American, last year she was named the College Division Women's Academic all-American of the Year.

An active member of the College Heights United Methodist Church, Christie served as a bible school instructor and supervisor. She has also served as a counselor and language arts instructor at a summer camp for disadvantaged inner-city youths.

Christie will receive her award from Donald Wilson, president of Pittsburg State.

Lisa Fernandez, University of California, Los Angeles, Softball.

Lisa Fernandez, we are told, did not coin the phrase: "You can't hit what you can't see." Whoever did, though, probably had her in mind. Many consider her the best all-round player in the history of the sport of softball.

A four-time NCAA all-American, Lisa ranks second in NCAA history with a four-year earned-run average of 0.22. She pitched 11 no-hitters and three perfect games in her career. Lisa owns NCAA records with a 93-7 career record, 42 consecutive victories and a 29-0 record her junior year.

Lisa led UCLA to two Women's College World Series Championships. The other two years? The Bruins were runners-up. In the 1992 College World Series, Lisa pitched 35 consecutive scoreless innings, striking out 39 batters and allowing just 13 hits and two walks. Lisa followed that up with two no-hitters in this year's series.

Lisa's offensive stats are almost as impressive. She led the nation in hitting with a .520 average as a senior. Her .382 career-batting average placed her in the NCAA's all-time top 20. Only three college softball players in history have had more career hits than Lisa. She played on U.S. teams in international competition that won an incredible nine gold medals, including victory in the World University Games. She earned dean's list recognition and was selected to the Pacific-10 Conference all-academic team.

Lisa has contributed time to the Special Olympics and has lent her

efforts to programs about high-school students staying in school and away from drugs.

Lisa will receive her award from Judy Holland, senior associate athletics director at UCLA.

Nnenna Lynch, Villanova University, Track and Field.

Villanova track and field coach Marty Stern was quoted recently in Sports Illustrated as saying that Nnenna Lynch should someday be President of the United States. Judging by her accomplishments thus far, I would say that if Nnenna wants to be President, it will only be a matter of time.

An eight-time NCAA all-American, Nnenna helped lead the Wildcats to four consecutive NCAA cross country championships. Nnenna won two Big East and three Eastern College Athletic Conference individual championships and finished third as a junior in the NCAA cross country championships. She won the 3,000-meter run at the 1992 NCAA outdoor track and field championships. Later that year, she earned a spot in the finals of that event at the U.S. Olympic trials.

Nnenna's academic accomplishments rivaled her numbers on the track. An NCAA postgraduate scholarship winner, she graduated from Villanova with a 3.92 grade-point average, majoring in sociology. Nnenna was a first-team academic all-American, and was the 1992 Big East Conference Scholar-Athlete of the Year. To top it all off, Nnenna was recently named NCAA Woman of the Year.

Nnenna joins us tonight after a long flight from London, England, where she is busy representing Villanova as its first-ever Rhodes scholar. As an undergraduate, Nnenna was an active public speaker at Villanova, visiting local children's hospitals and youth groups. She was instrumental in Villanova's campus ministry program. Her special project was the "Soup Kitchen" program, which helped feed the homeless of Philadelphia.

Nnenna will receive her award from Gene DeFilippo, the athletics director at Villanova.

John Roethlisberger, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, Gymnastics.

Many of us have seen the popular movie "Sister Act." We are fortunate tonight to witness the NCAA version of "Brother Act." Two years ago on this stage, Marie Roethlisberger received a Top Six Award. Tonight John and Marie become the first siblings to receive Top Six honors.

A 15-time all-American gymnast, John is only the third person in the 51-year history of the NCAA gymnastics championships to win three all-around titles. He has also won the NCAA parallel bars competition twice.

A 10-time Big Ten Conference champion who earned titles in the all-around, parallel bars, horizontal bars, pommel horse and vault, he is the first gymnast to win four all-around titles. This year he was presented with the Jesse Owens Award as the Big Ten's top athlete.

John earned a spot on the 1992 U.S. Olympic team, and has participated in the World University Games, the Goodwill Games and in two U.S. Olympic Festivals.

An NCAA postgraduate scholarship honoree, John graduated with a 3.34 grade-point average majoring in general management. A four-time scholar-athlete award winner, he was named the Academic all-American Athlete of the Year. He also served on Minnesota's student-athlete advisory council.

John also found time to serve as a volunteer for Special Olympics, the Make-A-Wish Foundation and as a volunteer coach at a gymnastics club for boys aged eight to 14.

John will receive his award from McKinley Boston, director of men's athletics at Minnesota.

Nnenna Lynch will respond on behalf of the current student-athletes.

Nnenna Lynch (Villanova University): Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for the recognition. When we stay up late nights studying and putting in the hours of training, we don't think of glory and attention. We do it because we want to do it. Still it is nice to have an award. Hey, why not us?

This is a special award, because it recognizes two aspects of our lives—academics and athletics. That is really special. I would like to call attention to the fact that three of the six people up here are women this year. I thought that was really neat. (Applause) I did have to wonder if this was a subtle idea of gender equity. It's not plaques we want, it is money. (Applause) I had to get that in there.

I don't think any of us excel because of personal initiative alone. Whether we admit it or not, we need support. So I would like to say "thank you" to the mothers, the fathers, the friends, the siblings, the coaches for the personal support; for that, "Hey, you did a good job," or when times are tough, the people that stand by you.

I would like to also thank the athletics directors, the schools, the colleges and universities, as well as the NCAA for providing the forum in which to develop our talents. Without that, where would we be? Thanks. (Applause)

Mr. Osgood: Thank you, Nnenna. I congratulate you and each of the other honorees.

SILVER ANNIVERSARY HONOREES

Mr. Osgood: Now, we salute the Silver Anniversary Honorees.

Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, University of California, Los Angeles, Basketball.

It is said that when Kareem Abdul-Jabbar played for UCLA's freshman basketball team, the UCLA varsity was the best team in the nation, but only the second-best on campus.

Once he arrived on the varsity, he led the Bruins to an unprecedented three consecutive NCAA basketball championships. He is still the only player to win the most outstanding player award in

three Final Fours. During his career, UCLA won an astonishing 88 games against just two defeats, including an unblemished 30-0 season his sophomore year. UCLA was unbeaten in 12 NCAA tournament games during Kareem's three varsity seasons. At the 50th Final Four in 1988, Kareem was named to the NCAA's all-time Final Four team.

A three-time consensus all-American and two-time college player of the year, he is perhaps the greatest offensive force in the history of basketball. Kareem averaged more than 26 points and 15 rebounds per game in his career and connected on 64 percent of his shots from the field. He went on to star in the National Basketball Association, playing on six NBA championship teams. He was selected to play in the NBA all-star game 17 times and was the first player to score 37,000 points in a career.

He was named Sportsman of the Year in 1985 by Sports Illustrated, a magazine whose cover he graced an amazing 27 times. Kareem has appeared in several feature films and television programs. He currently serves as an analyst on college basketball telecasts on ESPN. He is also making a name for himself as a film producer and is an accomplished author, having written two autobiographies.

Kareem has helped make basketball a universally popular sport and has conducted clinics for children throughout the world. In 1989, he established "Kareem's Kids," a program designed to motivate youth to stay in school.

Kareem will receive his award from Peter Dalis, athletics director at UCLA.

Lee Evans, San Jose State University, Track and Field.

Lee Evans, as did all our Silver Anniversary award winners, competed in college during a time of great social upheaval in this country. Fittingly, Lee today is making his mark as much off the track as he did on it 25 years ago.

In 1968, Lee set an NCAA record in the outdoor 400-meter dash and an American record in the 600 meters. He won a gold medal at the 1968 Olympics in the 400 meters, setting a world record that would stand for 20 years. Two days later, Lee anchored the United States to another gold medal and a world record in the 1,600-meter relay.

The following year, Lee captained San Jose State to its only NCAA track and field title at the outdoor championships. In all, Lee Evans owned three world records, two Olympic records, five American records and two NCAA records. Not surprisingly, he has been inducted into the U.S. Olympic and USA Track and Field Halls of Fame.

Lee has spent much of his adult life helping and teaching those less fortunate than himself. He has coached the national track and field programs in the countries of Nigeria and Cameroon, and currently performs those duties in Qatar. In 1991, he received the Nelson Mandela Award for his contributions to human rights.

He was an assistant professor at a university in Cameroon for six

years. In 1986, he was awarded a Fulbright professorship in that country. Currently, Lee directs the Madagascar Project, an assistance program in a village in Qatar.

Lee will receive his award from Tom Brennan, athletics director of San Jose State.

Calvin Hill, Yale University, Football.

With all of his athletics ability, Calvin Hill may only be the second-best athlete in his family. We will hear more about that later.

A two-time all-Ivy League football selection, Calvin earned honorable mention all-American honors his senior year at Yale. Not only did he lead the Eli in rushing that year, he also averaged 22.2 yards catching the ball. As if that were not enough, he completed seven of 12 passes for four touchdowns from his halfback slot. He shattered Yale's single-season touchdown record with 14, the career touchdown record with 24, and the career scoring record with 144 points.

Calvin also excelled on the track, setting a Yale record for freshmen in the long jump and school records in the long and triple jumps. A first-round draft selection of the Dallas Cowboys, Calvin promptly earned NFL rookie-of-the-year and all-pro honors. He played in two Super Bowls and was named to the Cowboys' all-time team.

Calvin has been vice-president for administrative personnel for baseball's Baltimore Orioles since 1987. He is a consultant with several entities, including the Cleveland Browns football club. He helped establish the Calvin Hill Day Care Center at Yale, and has served as National Sports chair for the National Association for Retarded Citizens.

Calvin and his wife, Janet, are cochairs of the Duke University Parent's Committee. You probably recognize Calvin's son, Grant, who has had some success in a different arena at Duke.

Calvin speaks frequently on college campuses and to businesses about drug and alcohol abuse and the important relationship between sports and academia.

Calvin will receive his award from Ed Woodsum, athletics director at Yale.

William Hurd, University of Notre Dame, Track and Field.

Our next honoree is the answer to a great trivia question: "Who was the first nonfootball athlete-of-the-year ever selected by the Notre Dame student body?"

William Hurd sat an American indoor record by running the 300-yard dash in 29.8 seconds in 1968. He established four school outdoor records, was a member of five record-setting relay teams and was the conference champion in the 100- and 200-yard dashes.

A three-time all-American in the 100 meters, he was a U.S. Olympic Team finalist in the 100- and 200-meter runs in 1968. An NCAA postgraduate scholarship winner, William may even be more talented as a musician than he was as a runner. He was named the outstanding young performer at the nationally acclaimed Notre

Dame Jazz Festival in 1967. He earned a scholarship to the University of California Music Conservatory and is currently recording his third release. Incidentally, we are being treated to his composition as I speak.

William has taught at both Tennessee State and Fisk Universities. He now directs a private ophthalmology practice in Memphis, specializing in cataract, glaucoma and diabetic treatment. He was awarded a U.S. and foreign patent for—let me see if I can get this right—a slit-lamp mountable intraocular biometer. William periodically provides free glaucoma and cataract screenings in the Memphis area. He also makes annual trips to Latin America to render eye treatment to the indigent.

In 1992, he received Notre Dame's Henry Foster Award, given annually to a former student-athlete who has performed distinguished service to the university and the community.

William will receive his award from Joe O'Brien, senior athletics director at Notre Dame.

Leroy Keyes, Purdue University, Football.

There is no doubt about the legacy Leroy Keyes left on the gridiron of Purdue University. You simply cannot turn a page in the Purdue records book without seeing his name.

A two-time unanimous all-American, Keyes was named the all-time greatest player in Purdue football history. He was also named to Purdue's 100-year anniversary football team on both offense and defense. It is little wonder.

Leroy could do anything you asked. He ran the ball, caught the ball, passed the ball, intercepted the ball. Heck, he even kicked off. How about these marks for a junior: 968 rushing yards; 19 touchdowns to lead the nation; 114 points to lead the nation; and he only finished third in the Heisman Trophy balloting!

As a senior, he crashed the 1,000-yard barrier and finished second in the Heisman race. Leroy averaged nearly six yards every time he carried the ball and is Purdue's all-time leading scorer with 222 points. He caught 80 career passes for more than 1,200 yards. He also passed for eight touchdowns during his career.

He owns a rightful place in the College Football Hall of Fame. Leroy went on to a six-year professional career, playing for the Philadelphia Eagles and the Kansas City Chiefs.

Currently, he is an administrator with the Philadelphia school district, helping principals, teachers, parents and students in a voluntary desegregation program. Leroy has also served in a variety of activities emphasizing career development.

He is involved with the NFL alumni program, which assists fund-raisers, dedications, hospital visits and charity events.

Leroy will receive his award from Steven Beering, president of Purdue.

Jim Ryun, University of Kansas, Track and Field.

Jim Ryun stands before us a shining example of what can be ac-

complished through hard work and the determination to overcome obstacles. You may not be aware that Jim nearly died as a youngster during a bout with peritonitis. But that did not stop him from developing into an athlete whose name is synonymous with the mile run.

In 1964, Jim became the first prep athlete to break the four-minute barrier and earned a spot on the U.S. Olympic Team.

At age 19, after running several sub-four-minute miles, he became the youngest person to receive Sports Illustrated's Sportsman of the Year Award. He also won the Sullivan Award as America's top amateur athlete.

As a collegian, Jim was a seven-time all-American and a 10-time Big Eight Conference champion. He led Kansas to the team title at the 1969 NCAA indoor meet, and won five NCAA individual championships.

Jim also owned five world records. His 3:51.1 mile in 1967 stood for nine years as a world record and for 16 years as an American record. A three-time Olympian, Jim won a silver medal in 1968 in the 1,500-meter run. The Kenyan team sacrificed a runner who set a torrid pace in the high altitude of Mexico City to disrupt Jim's pace. The Kenyan runner later apologized to Jim in yet another poignant scene from those momentous Games.

Currently, Jim is a youth pastor in Shawnee, Kansas. He is a spokesman for several organizations, including the Muscular Dystrophy Association and the Council for Better Hearing and Speech. An accomplished photographer, Jim has been published in Sports Illustrated, National Geographic and Redbook. He is also the author of three books, including an autobiography. Jim also makes mission trips to foreign countries to help in orphanages with medical needs and the building of homes.

Jim will receive his award from Bob Frederick, athletics director at Kansas.

Responding on behalf of the Silver Anniversary Honorees is Calvin Hill.

Calvin Hill (Yale University): Thank you very much. I want you to know that after I finished Yale, I went down to Southern Methodist University, another member school, and went to medical school. When the NCAA told me I would be responding, they said to limit it to two minutes. I am a Baptist who was trained to be a minister, I live in the Washington area and I am a Democrat. So that will be very, very difficult.

It is actually very sobering to be here tonight. I think that all six of us can't believe that it has been 25 years. I actually experience a slight amount of trepidation. When we say Today's Top Six and watched the highlights of their athletics careers, my concern was whether or not they would colorize our film. (Laughter)

I am always very mindful of who I work for, because after all, they do pay for my meals. I work for the Orioles. Lisa Fernandez, we do believe in gender equity. (Laughter) You can play for us any time you

want to. You can even throw underhand.

They say that things never happen before a person is able to handle them. That is especially true in my case. If you go back 25 years to 1969, you realize that Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, Lee Evans, Leroy Keyes, Bill Hurd and Jim Ryun were very strong names. I would go to Yale Station to pick up my Sports Illustrated and any one of those people might have been featured in a story. I am glad this didn't happen 25 years ago. I am glad I wasn't on the dais with those five 25 years ago because I may have retired at that particular juncture.

It is very sobering and especially an honor for me to have the privilege of responding not only on behalf of myself, but also these five superstars. It seems to me that all of us were fortunate to compete for our respective universities and to represent them in arenas that prepared us for the battlefield of life. We were all fortunate to learn that life is not always about scoring touchdowns, it is not always about breaking tapes or swishing nets. It is often about fumbles, about getting knocked down, missing a shot. It is often about false starts.

But life is always about getting up and starting over. I think that is what each of us learned while we were at our respective member NCAA schools and what we want to continue to experience. All of us were fortunate to learn the values of discipline, fellowship, teamwork, sacrifice and perseverance. We learned how one plays is a symbol of how one will behave throughout their life. These lessons and values augmented all of those very important lessons that we learn in the classroom. So there was compatibility between academics and athletics.

I had a lot of great teachers at Yale, but two of them were also members of the athletics department. One was a man named Bob Giegengack. "Gieg" used to always say that education is not a product, it is not a mark, it is not a diploma. It is a process, a never-ending one. I think that all six of us understand that education is a process, a never-ending one.

Then there was the legendary athletics director at Yale, a man by the name of Bob Kiphuth. My freshman year, I had been switched from quarterback to linebacker. That was extremely traumatic for a guy who was used to getting a lot of attention and didn't have to do a whole heck of a lot physically. I thought about quitting football and perhaps spending more time at the library.

I mentioned this to Bob Kiphuth and he looked at me and he said: "You don't quit, you never quit, because if you quit this, you will quit in the classroom." That is another lesson, another part of that process.

So speaking on behalf of all six of us, we thank you, the NCAA, for providing the Bob Giegengacks, for providing the Bob Kiphuths, for providing those very special teachers, those very special coaches. I personally thank you for allowing me to be on this podium with five of the most special people that I have ever read about or have gotten to know.

You are at the cutting edge of a lot of issues that affect society. I wish you God's speed in that and hopefully 25 years from now I will come back and see some of these young people receiving the Silver Anniversary Award. This is a very special moment for Calvin Hill. Thank you very much. (Applause)

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AWARD

Mr. Osgood: Thank you, Calvin. Congratulations to you and your outstanding colleagues.

Now, it is time for us to turn our attention to the focal point of each honors program—the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the Association bestows on an individual.

Your program includes pictures of past winners of this award, which recognizes a distinguished citizen who, having earned a varsity athletics award in college, has exemplified ideals and purposes to which college athletics programs and amateur sports competition are dedicated.

It is a distinguished group. It includes former presidents, military leaders and pioneers in space and medicine. All truly have been worthy of this recognition. You will probably be as surprised as I was to learn that Rafer Johnson's name does not appear in the NCAA records book. After all, he was one of the greatest Olympic track and field performers of all time. And most of you are aware that the NCAA has sponsored championships in this sport for more than seven decades.

But during the time that Rafer was earning a reputation as the world's greatest athlete at UCLA, the decathlon was not contested in NCAA championships. Johnson lettered in both track and basketball during his years at UCLA. He gave indications of things to come by winning the AAU decathlon championship in 1956 and 1958. He also earned Sports Illustrated's Sportsman of the Year Award in 1958.

Rafer reached the zenith of his career in 1960 when he won the gold medal in the decathlon at the Rome Summer Olympics. Four years earlier, he had been the silver medalist at the Olympics in Melbourne, Australia.

In one of the most dramatic competitions at the Rome Olympics, Rafer and his UCLA teammate, C. K. Yang, who was representing Formosa, dueled through the two days for the unofficial title of "World's Greatest Athlete." Both were coached by UCLA's legendary "Ducky" Drake. C. K. was outstanding in the track events, but Rafer was absolutely spectacular in the field events. It all came down to the last race—the 1,500 meters. Rafer did not have to win the race, but he had to remain close enough to C. K. to maintain his point lead. As the two streaked in the home stretch, it was apparent that Rafer would win the gold. For his efforts, he won the 1960 Sullivan Award, symbolic of the nation's best amateur athlete.

Twenty-four years later, Rafer was once again the focus of Olympic activity. This time, he was given the honor of carrying the final torch

and lighting the Olympic flame at the 1984 summer games in Los Angeles. Now, a decade later, another Johnson is making headlines. His daughter, Jenny, is a star for UCLA's outstanding women's volleyball team.

Rafer's commitment to athletics and young people remains evident today. As president of Rafer Johnson Enterprises, he consults with companies that provide wholesome activities for today's troubled youth. He serves as chair of the board of directors for the California Special Olympics and also has served on the President's Council on Physical Fitness.

Rafer's board of director appointments include the United States Athletic Foundation, People to People International, and Parents and Friends of Mentally Ill Children.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is with great pleasure that I present to you Rafer Johnson, UCLA. (Applause)

Mr. Crowley: If I may just read the inscription on the award.

"In recognition of your superb undergraduate career as a student and athlete, and your continuing commitment to the highest personal standards, this award is presented to you for your continuing interest and concern for amateur athletics, and your distinguished leadership and exemplary commitment to enhancing the academic, athletics and emotional development of our nation's youth." (Applause)

Rafer Johnson (University of California, Los Angeles): Thank you very much. I am deeply honored to be present here this evening. I, like Calvin, asked how long would I be able to speak, knowing there had been at least two Presidents and a mayor who previously had received this award.

I got an interesting answer. I asked: "How long did those recipients speak?" Joe didn't give me that answer. He said: "You can have five minutes, but take as much time as you like." I said: "Did you tell Ronald Reagan and George Bush and Tom Bradley that?" He continued to eat and wouldn't answer that question. (Laughter)

I am pleased to be here. When I see those films, I am reminded of how painful some of those moments were, but how pleased after all these years of looking back on those moments I am that I had the tremendous opportunity to work with the people who became a part of my life at the university. All of these athletes on my right and left are here this evening because they, through their universities and colleges, were nominated by someone who thought that their performances, both in and out of the classroom and on and off of the field of competition, were deserving of them to be here.

I am pleased to be included with you fine athletes. I want to personally thank Charles Young, Pete Dalis and Judith Holland, who I know without their support, I wouldn't be standing before you tonight.

You know, sometimes it is just pure luck how things work out. It was mentioned about carrying the torch in the opening ceremonies of

the Games of 1984. Let me just tell you how that happened. I was on the board of directors of 60 people who were appointed by Mayor Tom Bradley. Out of that 60, 25 were named to the executive committee. I was one of the 25. On the day we were to select the gentleman who at that point was to head up the Games of 1984, there were two names on the ballot. I just heard a very brief discussion as I walked to one of the three open seats in the room and sat down.

As I sat down, a person sitting on my right said: "We have discussed this long enough. I think it is about time to elect someone to oversee these Games in 1984." They went around the room and when they got to me in the seat I just selected out of three, the score was 12 to 12. There were 12 votes for one candidate and 12 for Peter Ueberroth.

I cast the vote for Peter Ueberroth. He became the head of the Olympic team and I was selected to carry the torch. (Laughter) I have often thought, and this is the truth, if I had sat in one of the other two seats, you wouldn't even know where I was today. (Laughter)

I was most fortunate when I arrived at UCLA to be coached by a wonderful gentleman, a great coach and a friend—"Ducky" Drake. There is just one story I would like to share with you. It was the final race that you saw a portion of on the screen.

I was pleased by the outcome. I won a gold medal after finishing second in 1956 in the Melbourne Olympics. Coach Drake had told C. K. and I that the decathlon would probably come down to the final event. I don't think that either C. K. or I wanted to hear that. We wanted to believe that the decision would be made early, that one of the two of us will be so far ahead by then that it will be clear who was going to win and neither one of us would have to kill ourselves in the 1,500 meters. But it didn't turn out that way.

As we prepared ourselves to run this final race, each of us went to coach Drake to have him talk to us about what we were about to do. He gave both of us instructions as to how he wanted us to run the race. I won't bore you with a lot of details, but it boiled down to the simple fact that my strategies were just the opposite of C. K.'s. We talked about distance racing. Coach Drake told C. K. early in the race to see if he could build up a lead on me in the first three laps. He knew that C. K. was a much stronger distance runner than I was. If C. K. could pull out 15, 20 to 25 yards, I would never catch up. That was coach Drake's instructions to C. K. His instructions to me were: "Do not ever let C. K. build the lead up on you." (Laughter)

Coach Drake continued by further saying to C. K.: "Now, if by some chance you are not able to accomplish that, C. K., at the beginning of that third lap, if Rafer is in front of you, you go around him and really push him harder at that point." He knew full well that—and Jim knows this probably better than anyone in this room—you basically destroy a runner by showing him how strong you are, particularly toward the end of a race. That will demoralize

someone who maybe is not quite as good as that athlete in the event. I knew that C. K. was a better distance runner than I was.

Another thing that C. K. did during the course of the race was to continually look at me to see what I looked like and felt like and how I was feeling at that point in the race. Certainly, by the third lap, I am starting to drag a little bit. But "Ducky" said: "Whenever an athlete looks, they are looking to see what your reaction is going to be to that." I knew that C. K. was looking at me continuously during the course of the race. Toward the end of the race when I was probably the most tired, I decided that I would do what the coach asked me: "I want you to get up on your toes and I want you to look fresh." He said: "Make a noise, hit the ground hard like you can show C. K. you are ready." Sure enough, about the middle of the third lap, C. K. looked around and instead of sort of dragging at that point, I was on my toes and breathing real hard and running, pounding my feet on the ground.

We talked about this later, he said he couldn't figure out what I was doing. (Laughter) Again, I didn't beat C. K., as you saw on the film. But I was close enough to C. K. to win a gold medal. I don't tell that story because I won the medal. I tell that story because I think in terms of coach Drake's instruction to his two athletes—he allowed both of us to be the best that we could be. I really think that is what this evening is all about.

The younger athletes, the older athletes and the oldest athlete had the tremendous honor at our colleges and universities with the help of coaches, teachers and administrators to be the best we can be. I don't think that anyone can ask more than to have that opportunity to be as good as you can be. We are all fortunate to have those kinds of opportunities.

Back in the 1880s, Paganini, who was a musical genius of that time, had a violin and the experts thought that violin was the greatest instrument on the face of the earth. Paganini played it in an exemplary manner. Many of the people who followed the musical scene thought that the reason he was so good was the fact that he had this beautiful instrument and that anyone with any kind of talent could play that instrument well. He never let this instrument out of his sight.

One afternoon, he was visiting a small school, a group of young people, and the press followed him. The people in the community were there that afternoon. A youngster asked him if he would play his violin. This youngster had a violin. Paganini took the violin and he played with this instrument the same beautiful music that he produced from what was then considered the world's greatest violin. It became known to that small village, became known in that country and became known around the country that Paganini played beautiful music because it came from within the performer.

All of these athletes on the dais this evening and many athletes who are not here who have had the tremendous opportunity to be a part of a college or university in this country are as good as they are

and perform as well as they do because those institutions support their students and their athletes to the point that their individual music is able to be produced the way all of these individuals do in their own way in the sport that they play.

They are as good as they are and they perform as well as they perform because of the kind of support that all of you provide for those student-athletes in your college and university community. I don't think there is a time when I became more fully aware of what can happen when you are allowed to be the best that you can be than on one afternoon some 24 years ago when I was presenting medals to several Special Olympic athletes. I happened to present a medal to a young lady who had won the 50-yard dash.

When I put the medal over her neck, she began to weep like a lot of athletes do when they have had a great achievement and a great performance. But she continued this weeping through the process of the presentation. During the process, she waved at a group of people over my shoulder. She said: "Look, mom, look, dad, I won." That is not unusual, either. But I turned then to look at the parents and there was a group of people there and they were all weeping. I asked the young lady if she would take me to her family and introduce me to them when we were finished. She said: "Of course, I will."

When we finished, we stepped off the stage and went to this group of people. She introduced me to her mother by name and her father. She had some cousins and an uncle and aunt there. They began to weep even louder and more profusely than the wave and the salutation had caused.

So I waited about five minutes and asked the mother: "This is really something. Could you tell me what is going on here?" The mother said: "Mr. Johnson, our daughter has been in Special Olympics for one year. When she yelled, 'Look, mom, look, dad, I won,' those were her very first words that we've ever heard our daughter say."

I had been in sports for a number of years. I have seen great performances. But I don't think I have on any other occasion seen the implications of what can happen when someone is provided with an opportunity to be as good as they can be and display it on the field of competition and then be applauded for an effort. Then an athlete knows that he or she is, in fact, the best they can be.

It happens in Special Olympics and it happens on the college and university campuses throughout this country and around the world. I am very, very pleased to be among the athletes who can say that my performances had something to do with the fact that I worked hard. It had more to do with the fact that I had great coaches, people who made sure the facilities were available, great athletics directors and great administrators who allowed me to be as good as I can be.

I am pleased to be here this evening with these athletes. They, too, appreciate the fact that they have been given the opportunity to be as good as they can be.

Thank you very much. On behalf of my wife, my son and my daughter, I am grateful. (Applause)

Mr. Crowley: I would like to present this plaque commemorating the occasion in honor of one of the institution's most distinguished alumni to Charles Young, chancellor at UCLA. It is appropriate that Chuck is here tonight. It seems to be Bruins night. (Applause)

Chuck, congratulations.

Mr. Osgood: Well, this has been a most enjoyable evening for me. I am so pleased that I had the opportunity to participate in it. You are beautiful. We salute you—the members of this Association—for taking the time from your busy schedules to recognize these wonderful individuals who epitomize the values of intercollegiate athletics.

I thank you for allowing me to be with you this evening. God bless you, and I will see you on the radio. (Applause)

Mr. Crowley: Charles, thank you very much for that terrific job tonight in paying tribute to these outstanding individuals. We appreciate your spending your time with us. I am embarrassed to say I don't have the token of appreciation that I am to give you, which is a check. I had some other use for it. (Laughter)

But actually, it is just a copy of a check. It is a \$1,000 check that is made out to Fordham University in your name because we appreciate what you did for us. So Charles, if you don't mind standing and conjuring up in your mind, and the audience can join you, a picture of a thousand dollar check is right there. (Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, if you would please rise, I would like to ask President Gaudiani to come to the podium again. When the benediction is completed, you are free to leave.

BENEDICTION

Ms. Gaudiani: Let us pray.

Tender, powerful God, we thank you for tonight, which has made our spirits soar. We thank you for the lives and gifts of our honorees. Their lives show that sports overcome apathy. Through athletics, we ask you to turn our apathy to a blessed rage for justice in the lives of others.

Our honorees show us that sports encourages teamwork. Through athletics, turn our selfishness to solidarity with the disadvantaged and the discouraged. Our honorees show us that sports demands self-control, so through athletics, turn our weakness to a willingness to strive for excellence and to be role models for those caught in violence and self-destructiveness.

As we go forward now into our Convention, bless our deliberations and help us to remember that honor, integrity and justice come not from better rules but from finer spirits. Amen.

General Business Session

Monday Afternoon, January 10, 1994

The general business session was called to order at 2:55 p.m., with President Joseph N. Crowley presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

President Crowley: Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seat so we can begin this business session. I apologize for the delay in getting this general business session under way. We had a problem in getting the results of the morning votes in printed form. We now have those results and they are being distributed to the delegates.

The reconsideration window is now open for any action taken in the division sessions today. Are there any such motions for reconsideration?

RECONSIDERATION OF DIVISION VOTING ACTION

Reconsideration of Off-Campus Recruiting—Division I Football

Maynard M. Dolecheck (Northeast Louisiana University): Having voted on the prevailing side, I move for reconsideration of Proposal No. 31-B in Division I-AA.

[The motion was seconded.]

Donald E. Graham (Southland Conference): There are many pieces of legislation to which Divisions I-A and I-AA parallel each other. I think that the number of admissible off-campus recruiters should be one of those items. Both Divisions I-A and I-AA are committed to the same number of initial visits and initial encounters.

It is only fair that we both have the same number of recruiters off campus in seeking a similar number of potential student-athletes. I urge you to vote for reconsideration and to debate Proposal No. 31-B.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 31-B (page A-50) was approved by Division I-AA.]

[Part B of Proposal No. 31 (page A-50) was defeated upon reconsideration by Division I-AA, 37-67, 13 abstentions.]

Reconsideration of Preseason Football Practice—Orientation Period

Robert Aronson (University of Washington): I was on the prevailing side. I would like to move for reconsideration of Proposal No. 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

Noel Ragsdale (University of Southern California): I would like us to reconsider the vote and to consider what I think is a disparate

General Business Session _____ 289

impact this proposal has on the semester schools and quarter schools.

For the semester school, the first game frequently is at or about the first day of class. This four-day orientation period before the beginning of practice is extremely important for general orientation of students, particularly academic orientation.

By reducing this period to two days, it will have a significant impact on the ability of the institution to academically orient the new student. For quarter schools, the reduction makes a lot of sense. It has much less of an effect on them. The quarter schools may not even need a special orientation period time. Their starting time is much later. They have a greater period to orient the new students during the recess and the period before class starts because their activity is three or four weeks later than the quarter school.

For them, I understand that they tend to eliminate the orientation period. But for the semester schools, it is a vital period in which the new student-athletes can be meaningfully oriented, particularly to the academic identity of the institution and its students. I would appreciate reconsideration of your vote.

Karl P. Mooney (National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics): I would like to encourage reconsideration of Proposal No. 46.

Earlier today, this body defeated Proposal No. 43, which provided athletics aid to student-athletes to attend a summer session or courses before their initial semester of enrollment. By doing so, it made the days necessary for orientation even more valuable, particularly at institutions where students must come in for a period of time to take mandatory tests, go through registration and complete eligibility forms before school starts.

Once the school day starts, anyone involved in the football program knows it is very difficult to get both the attention of the student-athlete in order to facilitate all these processes. Therefore, I would encourage the membership to seriously consider reconsideration of Proposal No. 46.

Marcia L. Saneholtz (Washington State University): Just one point. This would have been an excellent piece of legislation if it had precluded practice on those two days of orientation, but it does not. So in reality, if half of the day is taken up with practice, we have one day for orientation. That is not sufficient to achieve what we have to achieve academically with our student-athletes.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 46 (page A-83) was defeated by Division I-A, 55-55, one abstention.]

President Crowley: Are there other motions to reconsider? I see no one at the microphones. The window of reconsideration is now closed.

We will proceed with the agenda of the general business session beginning with Proposal No. 11.

[Note: The results of votes taken in the division business sessions

were reported as the proposals appeared in the Convention Program and are not reprinted here unless additional action was taken. The results also appear in the proceedings of each business session and in Appendix A.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Principle of Gender Equity

James J. Whalen (Ithaca College): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 11.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is an attempt to establish and include a principle of gender equity in the Association's principles as set forth in Constitution 2 for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics.

The Association asserts the value of equitable participation and treatment of men and women in intercollegiate athletics to its structure, programs, legislation and policies. It is important that at the institutional level, gender equity in intercollegiate athletics describes an environment in which fair and equitable distribution of overall athletics opportunities, benefits and resources is available to men and women, and in which student-athletes, coaches and athletics administrators are not subject to gender-based discrimination.

The Gender-Equity Task Force set forth in its report for the membership that an athletics program can be considered gender equitable when the participants in both the men's and women's sports programs would accept as fair and equitable the overall program of the other gender.

The adoption of this principle will help to ensure that no individual will be discriminated against on the basis of gender in intercollegiate athletics. This is a principle designed to remind institutions of their obligations to comply with Federal and state laws regarding gender equity and to assist member institutions in complying with such laws.

Before I urge support of this proposal, I would like to thank my cochair, Phyllis Howlett, assistant commissioner of the Big Ten Conference, all members of the task force and our very fine consultants for their efforts in this difficult task. It has been for me a very memorable experience. Our charge was to define gender equity and develop principles and legislation that would guide our national office and our individual institutions in providing fairness for women and men. How well we have accomplished that job will be judged by you and our public in the years ahead. I ask you to read carefully the complete report that we submitted to the Council. What we approve today is just a beginning. We are directing institutions to evaluate their programs and move forward with equity for everyone.

The principle of fairness lies at the heart of what we are all about in the NCAA. We speak of level playing fields. I urge you to accomplish such a field for gender equity. Therefore, I urge you to support Proposal No. 11.

[Proposal No. 11 (page A-9) was adopted 804-1.]

Resolution: NCAA Membership Structure

R. Elaine Dreidame (University of Dayton): On behalf of the Council, the Presidents Commission and the Joint Policy Board, I move adoption of Proposal No. 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

This resolution recognizes the concerns regarding the NCAA membership structure that exists in each division and subdivision. As you know from an earlier mailing to the membership, the Joint Policy Board will appoint a committee to study membership structure. We have requested submissions from any interested group, conference or institution of possible structural models that will address the issues. Those are due in the national office by March 1.

Once they are reviewed by the Joint Policy Board, we intend to appoint one or more committees to review and comment on the model. The Board ensures that all constituent interests will be represented in appointing such a committee or committees.

This is very much a membership-directive project. All ideas and reactions are not only relevant but are strongly invited. Depending upon the complexities that might be encountered in reviewing all of the ideas, it may be possible to come forward with legislation for action at next year's Convention. If that is at all feasible, that is what will be done. In any event, action will occur not later than the 1996 Convention. This project is under way. I urge your support of it by your approval of this resolution.

[Proposal No. 13 (page A-16) was adopted, 776-21, six abstentions.]

Provisional Membership Category

Charles N. Lindemann (Humboldt State University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 14.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will establish a three-year application process for prospective NCAA institutions. The rationale of this legislation is stated clearly in the Official Notice.

I want to speak a little more about why this legislation is before you today. It was developed after discussion of both the Division II and Division III Steering Committees about the number of institutions that were joining the NCAA. There are concerns about those institutions preparedness to meet NCAA membership requirements and their ability to comply with NCAA rules and regulations. In some instances, we also had concerns about whether these institutions had the commitment to support the principles and philosophy statements of our respective divisions. Under the current process, all an institution that wishes to join the Association has to do is certify that it has complied with the appropriate criteria in its desired division for the previous two years. In some cases, that notification is the first official communication that the institution has had to the national office. In Division II, it is very rare when an institution can

certify that it has met all NCAA membership criteria.

We found that many institutions need waivers in order to be elected into active membership and then they still cannot meet all Division II membership requirements. They come back to the steering committee and request waivers that will allow them to be eligible for championship participation. In Division II over the last five years we have elected 66 new members. Ninety-seven percent of those members received waivers from Division II membership criteria in order to gain NCAA membership. Only 45 percent of those are currently eligible for championship participation.

With this proposal, the provisional member would pay the same annual dues required of active members. The first year is designed to be an orientation period in which the member will receive all official NCAA forms, publications and general information from the national office regarding the requirements of the Association. During the first, second and third years, a provisional member will be required to attend the NCAA Convention. Provisional members in Divisions I and II must attend at least one regional compliance seminar each year conducted by the NCAA or a number of conferences. The member will also be required during the first year to complete a comprehensive self-study over the evaluation of its athletics program. We believe this self-study will give the institution's chief executive officer an opportunity to determine early in the process whether that institution is ready to make the commitment to adhere to NCAA rules and regulations.

During the second and third years of the provisional membership, the institution will be required to administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of this Association, including in Divisions I and II the requirement that their coaches be certified before recruiting off campus. Provisional members will be required to provide the Council on an annual basis a written report describing each institution's progress in meeting membership criteria. The provisional member may be counted as an NCAA opponent for the purpose of meeting scheduling requirements. No waiver opportunity will be available to a provisional member other than those related to circumstances beyond an institution's control. At the end of the provisional membership period, the member can be elected to active membership by the appropriate steering committee.

Once the member has been active for a minimum of two years, it is eligible for championships. A consistent procedure for all divisions provides for an education period before an institution can be elected to active membership and before it is eligible to participate in NCAA championships.

On behalf of the Council, I urge you to vote for Proposal No. 14.

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, as well as the Division III Subcommittee of the Presidents Commission, I also urge you to support this proposal.

Membership growth of the Association has been especially pronounced in Divisions II and III. This proposal would ensure that new members are better prepared to understand and fulfill the responsibilities of membership in the NCAA. This is significant legislation that will benefit all three divisions. It also will accommodate any restructuring that may occur. I encourage you to adopt it.

Keith R. Phillips (Seattle Pacific University): We move to vote on Part H separately.

[The motion was seconded.]

The first two elements of Part H deal specifically with items that pertain to the three-year provisional aspects to which we just voted upon.

The aspects of the items in Bylaw 20.2.3 are really kind of an addendum to the whole concept of the three-year provisional membership. This speaks to an additional two years before being eligible for championship play. We feel this issue should be voted upon separately.

[The motion to vote on Part H of Proposal No. 14 was approved.]

President Crowley: It is necessary that this motion pass all three divisions. It has failed in Division I. There is no reason to proceed with Divisions II and III. We will take up Part H separately but not subdivide it.

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): If this is going to be voted on in all three divisions at the same time, I ask that the motion to divide has to pass in all three areas. I thought this was listed as a divided vote. Each division could adopt or not adopt various segments. If that is the case, the parliamentary ruling would not be correct in this matter. The voting in Division I wouldn't govern Divisions II and III in a divided vote.

President Crowley: My understanding, sir, this being a common provision rather than a federated provision, it is necessary that it pass each division separately. So if any division defeats it, it is defeated for all. That is the ruling of the chair. It is also not only the ruling, it is in the constitution.

Mr. Hammond: I would ask the parliamentarian to rule on whether or not there should have been an opportunity to discuss the motion to divide, as far as the rationale, before the vote.

President Crowley: It is a nondebatable motion, sir.

Mr. Hammond: I know that is in Robert's Rules. I thought maybe fairness would be a part of that.

President Crowley: I am told we are not allowed to do that.

Mr. Phillips: That being the case, I assume we will have an opportunity to provide rationale for the issue of voting on Part H?

President Crowley: Yes, sir. You can discuss Part H now, if you like. Please proceed.

Mr. Phillips: Obviously, the concern of many in Division II primarily is with Bylaw 20.2.3. We need to consider the impact Part H will have on Bylaw 20.2.3. This part of H requires in addition to

the three-year provisional guidelines, which we are in support of, two additional years after active membership to be eligible for championships. The current practice is a total of five years to be eligible for active championships from the point of application.

Concerning the ability of new members to fulfill their compliance for eligibility and to understand clearly what that means, since no waivers will be allowed and two years of compliance will be required before active membership will be started, we feel that should be adequate. The additional two years before being eligible for championships is very restrictive. It could preclude a member institution from participating in championship play for a total of four years.

That is problematic for several reasons. Number one, recruited students can't enroll in those institutions and would be prohibited from competing for a national championship there during their entire collegiate experience. Number two, in some geographical areas of the country, the membership is in desperate need of additional members. In the Pacific Northwest, our closest Division II member is in California; Billings, Montana; Anchorage, Alaska, or Chaminade in Hawaii.

There are institutions in the NAIA (National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics) who would be interested in joining us and creating a more contiguous regional conference affiliation. But with the two-year requirement, they are certainly not interested in pursuing that. Some have suggested that could be covered if these schools would pay their dual membership during that four-year period. The NAIA has moved from a district system of qualification and governance to a conference system. The conference scheduling requirements for most or all of those conferences, in addition to Division II scheduling requirements in men's and women's basketball, would make it impossible for those schools to retain their dual membership. Therefore, the NAIA membership would be in a noncompetitive status for the full four years. We support all the essential components of the three-year provisional membership. We feel, however, to correct the excesses of the waiver system that to tack on an additional two years and to keep people away from championship play for that period of time is excessive.

We therefore urge the defeat of Part H of this amendment. I recommend that our colleagues in Division II defeat it.

Mr. Hammond: I will not repeat my colleague's earlier remarks, but just add one point. One of the requirements of the proposal—the three-year provisional period—would be required. If an institution meets these standards and all the criteria, they would still be ineligible. Even though they meet all the requirements, they still would be ineligible for two additional years. We feel that is unfair.

Secondly, you will note the operational date on the proposal is scheduled to go into effect September 2, 1994, which means a September 1 deadline date to apply for membership. This current year is not covered by this particular piece of legislation. It opens the

door for anyone who wishes to apply before that time to run in without having to wait five years. I don't believe it is in the best interest of our institutions to rush those decisions or create this kind of barrier, especially when we have all the things necessary to make sure that during the three-year provisional membership they either meet standards to compete in championships or they are ineligible.

[Parts A through E of Proposal No. 14 (page A-17) were adopted, 773-22, four abstentions. Parts F, G and I were adopted by Division I, 290-7, eight abstentions, Division II, 193-15, two abstentions, and Division III, 248-7, five abstentions. Part H was defeated by Division I, 235-56, 13 abstentions, Division II, 65-145, and Division III, 139-117, 10 abstentions. Parts J through N were adopted, 301-1, two abstentions. Part O adopted 100-1, two abstentions. Part P adopted, 117-0. Part Q adopted, 198-2. Part R adopted, 256-7.]

Resolution: Need-Based Financial Aid

Charles S. Harris (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Council, the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, and the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 16.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Harris: On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 16-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

In an attempt to reduce the cost of intercollegiate athletics, there are various constituencies within the Association, including the Gender-Equity Task Force and the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics, that have called for an examination of possible cost-saving measures among Divisions I and II members who provide athletics grants. In this regard, the Presidents Commission and the Council have given the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism the opportunity to develop a financial aid model. By adopting this resolution, the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism will develop a model that will remain based on need. We will specifically be required to make legislation to be presented in a progress report at the 1995 Convention. It is important to remember that there will be actual discussion of this issue by the membership before an effective conclusion by the committee.

[Proposal No. 16-1 (page A-28) was adopted, 439-61 two abstentions.]

Resolution: Five Seasons of Competition

Milo R. Lude (Auburn University): I move Proposal No. 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

This morning in our Division I-A session, Proposal No. 17 was withdrawn with the understanding that we would bring this before the Convention. If we believe in higher education, then we certainly believe in the search for the truth and the facts with some logic behind it.

We therefore would like very much to have the Convention study

the proposal of the five-year rule. We ask all of you to support this.

Jerry L. Kingston (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Council, I rise to oppose Proposal No. 18. We do not need another resolution and another study to develop this. There are better ways to increase graduation rates and to contain cost.

The sponsors argue this proposal will raise graduation rates and lower costs. Current legislation provides the opportunity to provide a fifth year of athletics aid while the student is competing. The postscholarship provides the opportunity for the fifth year of aid while the student is not competing.

The student's welfare is not enhanced when time and energy is divided between athletics and academics over a five-year time period. This proposal is not in the Council's view with the reform movement. It is an attempt to place more emphasis on the student-athletes than the students themselves. I urge you to defeat this proposal.

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): I would remind the membership that yesterday our executive director said that 1995 is going to be the Convention for the student-athlete's welfare. I can think of no better way to address that concern than to study the information and see whether or not we are meeting the welfare of the student-athlete at this point in time.

Times do change. There is a need for more students today than ever before and the ability to fund universities has shrunk. More students are seeking outside employment. The institution has increased the graduation rate and some say this will reduce the number who graduate.

We may continue to see students have an increasingly difficult time from the beginning of the required courses to stay on track. The Association has worked hard to meet the welfare of the student-athlete. This resolution does nothing more than charge the NCAA Council with bringing back to this body legislation based on more current information.

What is wrong with current information? Let's look at this with an open mind in fairness to our student-athletes at the Convention that is designated to their welfare. Let's make the decision with the best information. We do have greater obligations to matriculate students.

Mr. Lude: With respect to Jerry Kingston, my very good friend, I heard everything that he said. I think if he had listened closely, the Council is asking us to be very, very narrow-minded, have tunnel vision and not be exploratory.

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): It is hard for a chancellor to make an argument against studying something, but this proposal has been before this Convention time after time after time. I don't believe that we need another study to determine that this is a bad idea and we should vote it down to get it off the board.

Unidentifiable Delegate: I urge this Convention to support Proposal No. 18. We only have a resolution. We are looking at bringing

in line our satisfactory-progress rule, which says you have to take 12 hours per term. If you take 12 hours a term, you can't graduate in four years. It takes 4.7 years for the student-athlete to graduate right now. If we allow them to participate for five years, we will eliminate the redshirt rule and we will eliminate the hardship rule. We can save a tremendous amount of money in future scholarships. We can save recruiting costs, increase graduation rates and a lot of other positive things for the student-athletes. This is only a study. We believe that it is in line with the reform movement.

Robert C. Maxson (University of Nevada, Las Vegas): I am hard pressed at a Convention of educators to explain why we would be opposed to any study that will benefit our student-athletes. On most of our campuses, including mine, full-time students who are not athletes take programs that are impossible to finish in four years.

This proposal ought to be studied. It could benefit student-athletes in a number of ways. If we consider the academic progress and satisfactory-progress rules, then the fifth year becomes very important.

It seems to me that we have not followed the letter and spirit of the rule about student-athletes maintaining good academic standing. By definition, a student should have graduated at the end of five years, with the exception of those youngsters who might change majors.

We also talk a lot about cost containment. Obviously, this will be a less expensive way to run our programs. We know that recruiting is expensive. This even has the potential to reduce recruiting by as much as 20 percent. I also remind you that one of the most vulnerable times for many programs is when we are recruiting student-athletes. I urge you to support the resolution to call for a study of the fifth-year of competition. We owe it to the student-athletes who do expect to graduate and we owe it to those universities who want to graduate their student-athletes.

Calvin Bowers (Bowling Green State University/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): For those of you in attendance at the honors dinner last night, you will recall that one of the Top Six athletes who was honored was Kenneth Alexander from Florida State.

He not only has had success as a football player, but he intends to graduate in 3½ years with honors. This shows that four years of schooling is not only sufficient but reasonable, despite the demands placed on student-athletes.

If the student-athlete does require a fifth year to complete his studies, it should be done so without a required additional season of eligibility. By doing this, he concentrates solely on academics and prepares for life after collegiate athletics instead of the pressures and physical burden of competition. We oppose a study about five-year eligibility.

[Proposal No. 18 (page A-30) was defeated, 158-649, two abstentions.]

Revised Legislative Calendar

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

This would provide two additional weeks in which to present to the membership amendments to our bylaws and constitution. Because of the pressures of meetings in May and June, we need this extra time. The rather complicated language does that and no more than that. I urge the membership's adoption.

R. Elaine Dreidame (University of Dayton): On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I would like to speak in support of this proposal. The Commission and Council believe that moving the submission date two weeks later will make the process more effective without compromising the intent of the legislative calendar. We urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 19 (page A-31) was adopted, 464-335, four abstentions.]

Resolution: Biennial Convention

Bro. Thomas J. Scanlan (Manhattan College): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I move adoption of Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics originally recommended this amendment of the NCAA Constitution to provide that Conventions be held only in alternate years.

After further consideration, the Council determined and the Presidents Commission agreed that legislation to limit the Association to biennial Conventions was premature. Instead, both the Council and the Commission agreed to sponsor this resolution. Its adoption would call for a detailed study of the issue, particularly as to the actual cost savings to the Association and the level of interest on the part of the membership.

The biennial Convention has the possibility to stabilize the Association's legislation by mandating more time between amendments. They would have a more reasonable time period to prepare legislation. It would eliminate the rush to review proposed legislation and create opportunities for members who wish to propose the amendments to discuss them with the sponsors. A vote in favor of this resolution does not change the Association's legislative process. It merely will put in motion a review of the concept of biennial Conventions. On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I urge your support of this resolution.

Marilyn McNeil (California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo): If the Convention in off years is for discussion only, that will create an administrator's nightmare. Dollars could be better spent on purposes other than a study.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): The dif-

ficulty that I have with the resolution is the fact that it is couched in the exclusivity of cost effectiveness only. On that basis, it abrogates the facilitation of other areas of concerns, such as the necessity for frequent meetings if they relate to legislation that must be passed or acted upon now, as opposed to two years hence.

Given the fact that that does exist, we are urging that we vote this resolution down.

[Proposal No. 20 (page A-34) was adopted, 464-335, four abstentions.]

Independent Hearing Officer

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I move adoption of Proposal No. 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal allows the use of independent hearing officers in major infractions cases. Such hearing officers would be appointed at the sole discretion of the Committee on Infractions and would review the disputed facts concerning alleged violations and present findings of fact to the Committee on Infractions.

A few years ago, this idea was advanced by the so-called Lee Committee and was recommended with a number of changes in enforcement procedures. Most of those recommendations were acted upon at the 1993 Convention. Two, however, were held over for further review: the proposal to use independent hearing officers in major infractions cases and the proposal to make infractions hearings open to the public.

The Council and the Presidents Commission agreed to create an ad hoc committee to review these two items. I chaired that committee. The ad hoc committee believes that the changes in the enforcement procedures enacted in 1993 should be allowed to work out before we consider the addition of public hearings. The committee, however, determined that the use of independent hearing officers would enhance the infractions process. This proposal does not diminish the authority of the Committee on Infractions. The committee has the sole discretion to appoint a hearing officer.

Appropriate use of hearing officers can be of considerable benefit to the committee, particularly in cases where there are complicated factual situations. The use of an independent jurist, who is the law on disputed facts, enhances the public perception of fairness and confidence in the process. I urge the adoption of this proposal.

[Parts A, C and D of Proposal No. 21 (page A-34) were adopted, 762-40, four abstentions. Part B was adopted by Division I, 291-19, Division II, 200-6 and Division III, 252-14.]

Resolution: The Student-Athlete: Welfare, Access and Equity

Donald F. Behrend (University of Alaska Anchorage): On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposals 52 and 53 represent the next steps in implementing the agenda of the Presidents Commission's strategic plan. Last year, the Convention adopted a resolution calling for a study of issues central to student-athlete welfare, access and equity, the third topic in the Commission's original three-year strategic plan.

The next step is for the Presidents Commission and the Council to consider recommendations from the Special Committee to Review Student-Athlete Welfare, Access and Equity, and to bring forward proposals for legislation and other actions to the 1995 Convention.

President Jim McComas chaired this committee until health problems forced his retirement. I have been chairing it since. Proposal No. 52 would direct the Commission and the Council to consider recommendations in 1994 and submit appropriate legislation, if any, and other recommended actions.

Much of what is recommended will not be legislative in nature. Some of it may be in the area of deregulation. While the nature of the recommended actions remain to be seen, the adoption of this resolution will direct the process to continue. I urge the Association's approval of Proposal No. 52.

[Proposal No. 52 (page A-89) was adopted 792-2.]

Resolution: Integrity: Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct in Intercollegiate Athletics

Charles Young (University of California, Los Angeles): I move Proposal No. 53.

[The motion was seconded.]

As Chancellor Behrend just stated, this resolution launches the next topic in the Presidents Commission's strategic plan. The resolution introduces the topic, as directed by the Commission in consultation with the Council and other constituencies, to conduct a study.

The topic encompasses integrity, sportsmanship, ethical conduct in intercollegiate athletics and the student-athlete's welfare. I urge your adoption of this resolution.

[Proposal No. 53 (page A-89) was adopted, 759-1.]

Claire L. Gaudiani (Connecticut College): As the Convention concludes Presidential Agenda Day and before many of our proud presidents will leave this meeting, I would respectfully request that we pause to thank the three outgoing members on the executive committee of the Presidents Commission. Each has served with distinction.

They are the chair of the Presidents Commission, President O'Brien; chair of Division I, Chancellor Young, and chair of Division II, President Lubbers. We would like to thank them. (Applause)

President Crowley: Ladies and gentlemen, this is the end of the Presidential Agenda Day. Thank you very much.

[The Presidential Agenda Day of the meeting was recessed at 5 p.m.]

Tuesday Afternoon, January 11, 1994

The general business session was called to order at 3:20 p.m. with President Crowley presiding.

President Crowley: Ladies and gentlemen, we need to begin this concluding general session of the Convention. I have some information about this Convention that you may be interested in. This is the largest Convention ever in terms of attendance for the first time. More than 2,400 people have been in attendance at the Convention. Also in terms of the number of vote counts, I don't know whether that makes it the most productive Convention or not, but we have had more than 800 for the first time. So, we have cracked that 800 barrier.

REPORTS

[Note: Motions were made, seconded and approved to accept the reports of the sports and standing committees, secretary-treasurer, Council and Executive Committee.]

SUPPLEMENT TO MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Catherine C. Haker (College of St. Rose): In addition to those individuals recognized on Sunday, please add the following:

Ralph Bishop, Jackson State University
Dr. Richard E. Bullock, Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Adrian Christenson, St. Olaf College
William Chisolm, Long Island University
Robert J. Durkin, State University College at New Paltz
Hubert Heitman, University of California, Davis
Robert Kline, Ohio University
John Kurtz, Georgia College
O.W. Moses, Alcorn State University
William Pierce, William Paterson College
Perrine Rockafellow, Colgate University
Leland Smith, Rhodes College
Hugh F. Stephens, Randolph-Macon College
Arnold "Swede" Umbach, Auburn University
William O. Whetsell, Marietta College

Please stand and observe a moment of silence for those who have gone before us. Thank you.

OPENING REMARKS

President Crowley: Thank you, Cathy.

As we begin voting on the remaining legislation before this Convention, let me report to you again that all of the voting actions during the business sessions will appear in next week's issue of The NCAA News under the date of January 19. That issue will have a record of all the votes taken at this Convention.

We will begin with the consent package—Proposal Nos. 1 through 10.

Doris R. Soladay (Syracuse University): I move the consent package.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

President Crowley: We now have an opportunity for reconsideration of earlier voting actions. The "window of reconsideration" is now open. Is there any desire to move reconsideration on any of the proposals not in the Presidential Agenda Day Consent Package?

RECONSIDERATION OF VOTING ACTION

Reconsideration of Training-Table Meals

Bonnie Slatton (University of Iowa): I would like to move reconsideration of Proposal No. 126.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would ask that we reconsider this. There was a tie vote yesterday. The reason for a training table during competition is obvious. Student-athletes have trouble scheduling their meal time around competition and practice. In noncompetitive time, student-athletes should be integrated into the general student body. A vote for this is a vote for cost containment and student-athlete welfare. I would urge us to reconsider and adopt this proposal.

Delbert M. Shankel (University of Kansas): I recognize that this is a cost-containment issue. Our staff has discussed the issue carefully. It concluded that because of the logistics of staff and other employment, that it is really more cost effective for us to retain the training table than it is for us to eliminate it. I would speak in opposition to reconsider and in opposition to the motion if it is reconsidered.

Jason C. Wilkie (Central Michigan University/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): We oppose this proposal because of the athlete's concern about being a competitive student. These need to be put before cost reduction. We urge your opposition to reconsideration of this proposal.

Waneen Spirduso (University of Texas at Austin): We urge the delegates to vote against reconsideration. We have three factors that we think are important. There are times when our regular dining facilities are closed and when our athletes must be on campus. It makes it difficult for them to find a way to eat. The second is that the association between eating disorders and college athletics is well documented. We use our dining facilities as a part of an integrated educational program. The third one is that we believe that the dining facility training table is one area where all the teams in the athletics department are together and where the coaches can find these athletes. It is an important means to develop camaraderie within the department. We urge you to vote against reconsideration and if it is reconsidered to vote against it.

Morgan Burke (Purdue University): I would remind the delegates that the proposal deals with out-of-season training tables. We have had many years of experience with this. It has worked successfully in the area of cost containment. We think the motion for reconsideration should be passed.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 126 (page A-164) was defeated.]

Karl P. Mooney (National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics): I request the indulgence of the chair in allowing me to know about Proposal No. 46, which failed for reconsideration by a tie vote—55-55 and one abstention. Is it okay to ask for reconsideration of that proposal?

President Crowley: There are two problems with that. One is that the rules of the Convention restrict reconsideration opportunities to a single time. Secondly, that item is in the Presidential Agenda Day set of proposals, and those cannot be reconsidered after the Convention rules on the subsequent day.

Is there any further interest in reconsideration? The "window of reconsideration" is now closed. We will go back to the agenda.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

President Crowley: Ladies and gentlemen, I do have an announcement of some consequence to convey to you. Earlier this afternoon, it was announced that Mike Clary from Rhodes College had passed away. He just wanted us to know that he is still with us. Congratulations to Mike. (Laughter) These Conventions can be deathly dull, but I didn't think they were that bad. (Laughter)

Now, going on to the agenda.

Eligibility Committee—Appeal Procedures

Robert M. Sweazy (Texas Tech University): On behalf of the Council and the Eligibility Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 78.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would be effective immediately. It would allow senior woman administrators and individuals designated by the chief executive officer to submit eligibility appeals to the Eligibility Committee. By expanding the number of individuals who may submit appeals, institutions can handle the preparation of appeals more quickly and without delay. The Eligibility Committee notes that senior woman administrators often have significant involvement in the preparation of information for these appeals, but currently need the signature of another administrator to initiate the official process.

The expanded list of individuals with this authority would be consistent with the designation of individuals who may contact the national office and receive interpretations from the legislative services staff. Please join the Council and the Eligibility Committee in support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 78 (page A-114) was adopted.]

Marketing Student-Athlete to Professional Teams

Ronald J. Maestri (University of New Orleans): I move Proposal No. 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council, I request your consideration and support

for this proposal. It provides student-athletes the opportunity to get the best information available to enhance their transition to a professional athletics career.

By the nature of the professional association, academicians and coaches develop contacts that contribute to the benefit of student-athletes seeking employment opportunities after college. Coaches are often in the best position to elicit information from their colleagues in a professional league about a student-athlete's market value, potential draft position or opportunity to try out as a free agent. Likewise, the university's professional sports counseling panel or coach is in a position to assist the student-athlete in securing reliable information on various sports agents, their methods of operation and the success of their clients.

Without the involvement of the sports counseling panels or coaches, who are entrusted to have the student-athlete's best interest at heart, unscrupulous agents and representatives have a better opportunity to take advantage of the student-athlete. This proposal enables the student-athlete to base his or her decisions on better information. In turn, the coach can be sanctioned if he or she influences a student-athlete in such a way that the coach gains financially from the position of trust.

Also in this proposal, the coach has to account for his or her involvement to the professional sports counseling panel or the institution's chief executive officer. The proposal encourages ethical coaches and professional sports counseling panels to appropriately be involved to offset the negative influence of unscrupulous agents. I urge you to support Proposal No. 54.

[Proposal No. 54 (page A-90) was adopted.]

On-Campus Employment

R. Elaine Dreidame (University of Dayton): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 79.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism believes this proposal is in the best interest of institutions and student-athletes. Currently, on-campus employment in Divisions I and II is considered institutional financial aid. It therefore is included in the student-athlete's full grants-in-aid limit as well as the institution's team limit in the student-athlete's sport.

By adopting this proposal, on-campus employment earnings would be treated consistently with the criterion used for counting off-campus employment earnings. This proposal was narrowly defeated during last year's Convention. The financial aid committee has modified this proposal to address concerns raised at that time. Specifically, it would permit a student-athlete to exempt from a team-equivalency limit earnings from on-campus employment outside the athletics department, provided the athletics interests in the institution do not assist the student-athlete in obtaining the employment other than through the assistance of institutional staff members who provide

that service for all students. Institutions that want to count such on-campus employment for their Division I financial aid minimum may do so because the proposal only applies to Bylaw 15.

The NCAA staff stands ready to develop a resource document to help those institutions who wish to include all on-campus employment in meeting the membership requirements. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of this proposal.

Judith A. Davidson (Central Connecticut State University): This proposal is similar to Proposal No. 92 at the 1993 Convention. Bylaw 20 is amended so that all on-campus student employment earnings are not countable but may be included in reaching the appropriate minimums for Division I membership. I urge the passage of Proposal No. 79.

John R. Gerdy (Southeastern Conference): Because financial aid regulations significantly affect student-athletes' welfare, the members of the Southeastern Conference student-athlete advisory committee discussed this proposal at great length.

This committee believes that student-athletes should be allowed to take advantage of on-campus work-study employment opportunities, just like all other students on campus. It is important to note that on-campus employment within the athletics department or on-campus employment earnings for which athletics interests intercede on behalf of student-athletes will continue to count in the team equivalency rate.

This proposal simply exempts on-campus employment for which athletics interests do not intercede on behalf of the student-athlete. In other words, financial aid. It is available for all students. Current restrictions regarding such employment exist because member institutions do not trust each other. We are driven by a fear that athletics departments will manipulate the institution's financial aid process to obtain a competitive edge. In discussing this proposal, one of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee members posed the following question: "Why should we be penalized because institutions across the country do not trust each other?"

On behalf of the Southeastern Conference and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I urge your adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal 79 (page A-114) was adopted.]

State Reciprocity Tuition Agreements

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): For the Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 82.

[The motion was seconded.]

In response to a request from a number of institutions, the financial aid committee studied the recruiting and equivalency advantages of those institutions that have reciprocity-tuition agreements with neighboring states. Proposal No. 82 would eliminate the competitive inequities created by the state reciprocity tuition agreements inasmuch as those agreements would be considered institu-

tional financial aid. Under the proposal, a student-athlete in sports other than Division I football, basketball and ice hockey who is receiving athletics aid at a state reciprocity tuition reduction, granted without regard to athletics ability, would have to count the amount of tuition reduction against the institution's sport limitation.

On the other hand, in those same sports, even a recruited student-athlete who received a state reciprocity tuition reduction, not based upon athletics ability, would not be considered a counter, provided the student-athlete was receiving no athletics aid.

This proposal, which was withdrawn during last year's Convention, has been modified to include Division I football, basketball and ice hockey because recruited student-athletes in those sports receiving a state reciprocity tuition unrelated to athletics would become "counters" as soon as they engage in varsity competition. This only applies to student-athletes entering NCAA institutions on or after August 1, 1995, so it does not affect financial aid awarded to currently enrolled student-athletes or previously offered to prospective student-athletes. It also should be noted that this proposal does not affect current rules that require institutions to determine tuition waivers as countable for institutional financial aid in all Divisions I and II sports.

On behalf of the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism and the NCAA Council, I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 82.

Robert A. Stein (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I rise to oppose Proposal No. 82 and ask the delegates to vote "no" on this proposal. We believe that this is a well-intended piece of legislation. It is intended to level the playing field between universities and states that do not have reciprocity agreements by taking away a perceived management that is available to universities in reciprocity states.

Instead, this proposal creates a real disadvantage for universities in reciprocity states when calculating equivalencies when a partial grant is awarded. It makes the playing field much more uneven than is presently the case.

Assume that School A is in a state that has a reciprocity agreement with another state. The resident tuition, room and board within that state is \$8,000. Assume that the nonresident tuition, room and board is \$12,000. If School A in that state offers a student in a reciprocity state a \$2,000 partial scholarship, in calculating the equivalency we use \$2,000 as the numerator and \$8,000 as the denominator. That would be a .25 equivalency. If the \$2,000 were offered to a prospect in a nonreciprocity state, the numerator of \$2,000 would be used and the denominator of \$12,000 would be used, which is a .16 equivalency. If this legislation passes and \$2,000 is offered to a prospect in a reciprocity state, the \$4,000 difference by that reciprocity agreement will be added into both the numerator and the denominator. So the fraction would be \$6,000 over \$12,000, for a .50 equivalency.

The effect of Proposal 82 would grossly inflate equivalency calculations in partial grants to prospects in reciprocity states to the disadvantage of those universities having reciprocity agreements. I think this legislation is intended to have an equalizing effect, but it really doesn't achieve that result.

It was withdrawn last year to refine it a little further. I believe it still doesn't accomplish the purpose that it seeks and does have an adverse effect. So I urge you to vote "no" on Proposal No. 82.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): Over the last several meetings, the Interpretations Committee has spent significant time interpreting this legislation, which in my view is narrowly confined to a few upper-Midwest states. Since the legislation was originally adopted, there have been a couple of other states that have entered into similar types of reciprocity agreements. But they are not the same as the existing situation in the upper-Midwest.

I believe that there is significant confusion from the states that are involved as to how it applies. To enact NCAA legislation at this time may not be completely fair. I would like to make a motion that this matter be referred back to the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism to see if there could be a clearer understanding of how it would apply equitably to all institutions.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 82 (page A-117) to the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism was adopted.]

Financial Aid—Permissible Fees

Robert Bowlsby (University of Iowa): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 83.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Financial Aid and Amateurism Committee asked the Council to sponsor this proposal in order to address a technical flaw in the existing legislation. Currently, an institution can waive application processing fees for prospective student-athletes as long as it has a similar policy for other prospective student-grantees.

Unfortunately, most institutions do not determine which prospective students will receive grants until after an enrollment application is filed. As a result, most institutions do not have an application processing fee policy for prospective student-grantees.

The financial aid committee also believes that Proposal 83, which is permissive legislation, would not require Divisions I and II institutions to pay such fees and would address concerns that the current rule is applied inconsistently among institutions.

Finally, it is worth noting that this proposal would not apply to Division III. I ask you to join the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism and the NCAA Council in supporting Proposal No. 83.

Frank R.A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): I stand in opposition to Proposal No. 83.

Proposal No. 83 is representative of the kind of well-intentioned financial aid legislation often considered and adopted by the Association

without clear understanding of the implications. The proposal must be read very carefully. You should not be misled by the written rationale. If your institution defers application fees for student-aid recipients that is allowable for student-athletes, this legislation is unnecessary.

The rationale indicates this is permissive legislation. It will permit institutions with sufficient resources to pay the additional charge. The question is, can you afford to pay the \$20, \$30 or whatever the application fee is from your applicant pool of student-athletes? The passage of this legislation will result in increased costs. The price tag might be relatively small, but this is not cost containment and clearly not the way to face the challenge of athletics scholarships. Passage of this legislation is primarily for the benefit and advantage of fully funded programs. At the majority of institutions, there is no strong reason to pass this legislation. I urge your opposition.

[Part A of Proposal No. 83 (page A-118) was defeated. Parts B and C were moot.]

Financial Aid from Outside Source—Athletics Participation not Major Criterion

Robert Bowlsby (University of Iowa): On behalf of the Big Ten Conference, the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism and the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 85.

[The motion was seconded.]

While the members of the Big Ten Conference were formulating this proposal, the financial aid committee was also pursuing the issue on a separate track.

Both the Big Ten and the financial aid committee, with assistance from the Council, developed this legislation after recognizing that the current interpretation of the Association's financial aid rules would have an unintended impact for some outside groups that award scholarships with little relationship to the student-athlete's sport. The committee believes that outside financial aid awards should be permissible as long as no single institution or conference is permitted to gain a recruiting advantage as a result of the restrictions the scholarship donor might place on the recipient's choice of institutions.

As noted in the Convention Program, the financial aid committee and the Council will withdraw Proposal No. 86 because the Big Ten proposal more accurately captures the financial aid committee's original intent in finding a solution to the problem. The financial aid committee and the Council urge you to vote "yes" on Proposal No. 85.

[Proposal No. 85 (page A-120) was adopted.]

Summer Baseball—Staff Limitations

Ronald J. Maestri (University of New Orleans): On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 103. It will benefit student-athletes who participate in NCAA-sanctioned summer baseball leagues.

The NCAA currently funds and sanctions 11 summer baseball leagues. The commissioners of these leagues generally have little, if any, background in college athletics. They would like the input and the support of the college baseball community in making decisions that will impact student-athletes.

In most cases, this proposal will allow coaches or administrators to be a part of the league's board of directors and assist in making policy decisions that will have an impact on the welfare of student-athletes who participate in these leagues.

On behalf of the Council, I urge your support for Proposal No. 103.

President Crowley: I will take that as having been moved and we will assume that someone had seconded it. Is there any further discussion on 103?

[Proposal No. 103 (page A-141) was adopted.]

Multidivision Classification

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 111.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to permit a Division III institution that has a sport classified in Division I to apply for the Division I playing and practice season regulations of Bylaw 17 to that sport. In accordance with existing NCAA regulations, any Division III member that elevates one of its sports to Division I will have done so recognizing that it must play by the more restrictive rules of both Division I and Division III.

This proposal would provide limited relief from that requirement, but only insofar as playing and practice season rules are concerned. The sponsors of Proposal No. 111 believe that it is appropriate that such programs be allowed at least to schedule the same number of contests within the same length of playing season as their Division I opponents.

This proposal has the support of both the Division I and Division III Steering Committees. The Division II Steering Committee took no position. I would therefore urge the delegates of all three divisions to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 111 (page A-151) was adopted.]

Amateurism—Basketball Draft

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 120.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would allow a student-athlete in the sport of basketball to enter a professional league draft under certain conditions. This proposal has been researched and discussed by the Professional Sports Liaison Committee for several years. The committee believes that it has arrived at a proposal without any significant flaws that will benefit student-athletes.

One of the primary reasons that the committee believes this is an important proposal to adopt is its belief that student-athletes should

have the opportunity to investigate professional sports opportunities in the same way that other college students are allowed to review professional employment options from sources outside the institution. Additionally, the committee is concerned that some student-athletes make inadvisable decisions to enter the NBA draft based on advice from unreliable third parties. With the adoption of this proposal, that type of activity should cease.

Finally, the committee believes that in allowing student-athletes to be drafted and to participate in the negotiations will assist them in understanding what their market value is and in most cases provide evidence that they should return to school and finish their college education. This proposal does not allow a student-athlete to retain an agent without jeopardizing his or her eligibility, nor does it change current legislation related to try outs with professional teams.

On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of this important proposal.

Karl P. Mooney (National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics): I urge your support of this proposal.

As we have known, the Council, Presidents Commission, and all the delegates are concerned about graduation of student-athletes. This proposal encourages graduation and permits the student-athlete to develop his true market value and find out what the real value is in graduation. We encourage the delegation to look at this very carefully and to consider the implications in future years for other sports.

[Proposal No. 120 (page A-159) was adopted.]

Promotional Activities—Player/Trading Cards

Charles Cavagnaro (Memphis State University): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 121.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is the opinion of the NCAA Communications Committee and the Council that the selling of trading cards exploits the student-athlete, who must now pay to be certified to play college athletics and blurs the line between college and professional athletics.

This proposal does not prohibit cards for worthy projects, such as drug-education awareness and youth programs. This proposal is supported by the Communications Committee and supported by the Council. I urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 121 (page A-160) was adopted.]

Payment for Commercial Advertisements

Robert Bowlsby (University of Iowa): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 122 on behalf of the Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council and various committees have discussed many times in the last 10 years the issue of permitting an individual to forward to a charitable or educational agency an award or cash that the indi-

vidual cannot receive under NCAA legislation.

This proposal, which was drafted by the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, represents the culmination of efforts to narrow such a concept to an acceptable form. Proposal No. 122, if adopted, would address situations in which individuals in sports like tennis, swimming and gymnastics achieve athletics status at a relatively early age and are forced to choose between collegiate eligibility or appearing in a commercial advertisement.

Under current stringent regulations, an individual appearing in a commercial advertisement must receive pay for that involvement. This currently is not permissible under NCAA rules. This proposal would permit an individual to display athletics skill in an advertisement but only if it was before collegiate enrollment and only if the U.S. Olympics Committee or the appropriate national coaching body approved the appearance, received payment from the individual for the organization's general use and did not earmark the funds for that athlete.

The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee estimates the adoption of this proposal will result in processing fewer routine eligibility restoration cases by the NCAA Eligibility Committee. In addition, those who may be concerned that the proposal would lead to athletes securing agents to arrange such appearances can rest easy. Existing NCAA amateurism rules already prohibit an individual from being represented by an agent for the purpose of marketing his or her athletics ability or reputation.

On behalf of the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee and the Council, and in the interest of our nation's elite athletes, I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 122.

[Proposal No. 122 (page A-161) was adopted.]

Travel Expenses to Olympic Games

Nelson E. Townsend (State University of New York at Buffalo): On behalf of the Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 123.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, more than a year ago, studied a number of instances in which parents and relatives of student-athletes were not permitted to receive community funds to help defray their travel expenses to watch their son or daughter compete in the 1992 Summer Olympics.

Current legislation permits parents to receive such expenses from a commercial sponsor if that sponsor agrees to provide expenses to all parents of athletes attending the Games. The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee believes that this interpretation is too restrictive and denies many parents the opportunity to share this once-in-a-lifetime experience with their son or daughter.

Such a benefit should be deemed incidental to the athlete's participation in the Games. Therefore, the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee and the Council urge this Convention to adopt Proposal No. 123

and allow parents, legal guardians and other relatives to share in this very special event in a young athlete's life.

[Proposal No. 123 (page A-162) was adopted.]

Developmental Training Expenses

DeLores S. Todd (Atlantic Coast Conference): As a member of the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 124.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee believes that Proposal No. 124 provides flexibility to allow student-athletes to take advantage of the exception for developmental training programs at any time of the year while remaining consistent with the present rule's basic content.

Currently, the United States Olympic Committee or the appropriate national governing body may pay actual and necessary expenses for developmental training programs, provided the programs are conducted during the summer or other published vacation periods. This ensures that individuals miss no class time or individual competitions. The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee has discovered that many national governing bodies conduct training programs throughout the year, usually on weekends, thus making it feasible for student-athletes to attend U.S. Olympics Committee or national governing body trainee programs without conflicting with class or institutional competitions during the academic year.

On behalf of the Council and the entire Olympic Sports Liaison Committee and the gold of USA, I urge you to vote "yes" on Proposal No. 124.

[Proposal No. 124 (page A-163) was adopted.]

Travel Expenses—Exception

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): On behalf of the Council and the Interpretations Committee, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 130.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of Proposal No. 130 is intended to eliminate the distinction between travel-expense exceptions applicable to an institution's (or a student-athlete's) return from regular-season competition that occurs during a vacation period and an institution's (or student-athlete's) return from postseason events. Under current legislation, there are no restrictions related to an institution's (or student-athlete's) return from regular-season competition that occurs during a vacation period. The absence of any restrictions is not consistent with the original legislation to establish time limitations after the completion of an institution's (or a student athlete's) competition.

The adoption of the legislation will promote cost reduction as well as establish a consistent regulation applicable to all competitions regardless of where they occur. I urge your support of Proposal No. 130.

[Proposal No. 130 (page A-167) was adopted.]

Professional Sports Counseling Panels

Ronald J. Maestri (University of New Orleans): I move Proposal No. 125.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council, I request your consideration and support for this proposal. Inasmuch as professional sports counseling panels are empowered to provide advice and direction to student-athletes about professional athletics careers, including sports agent representation, the presence of a sports agent on the panel creates a conflict of interest that has the potential to damage the overall credibility, objectivity and effectiveness of the panel.

While the sports agent may have useful information to contribute to a student-athlete's decision-making process, the panel members should not be in a position to potentially gain from the special access and trust they hold with the student-athlete. I urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 125 (page A-164) was adopted.]

Travel Expenses—NCAA Championships and Postseason Bowl Games

Doris R. Soladay (Syracuse University): On behalf of the Council and the Interpretations Committee, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 131.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 131 is intended to limit the application of the travel-expense formula set forth in Bylaw 16.8.1.4.1 to travel in conjunction with NCAA championships or postseason bowl games.

The current legislation applies to NCAA championships or "special events" that occur during the vacation period. However, there appears to be inconsistency in the way institutions are defining "special events." Further, because the travel-expense formula can result in student-athletes receiving a significant amount of money, depending on which alternative is used, the potential for determining a contest a "special event" is increased.

This proposal will eliminate the need for institutions to determine whether a particular contest qualifies as a "special event." I urge you to support Proposal No. 131.

[Proposal No. 131 (page A-168) was adopted.]

Expenses—Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Meetings

Dorothy Dreyer (Wayne State University, Michigan): On behalf of the Council and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 132.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal, which would be effective immediately, would permit student-athletes to receive expenses from an institution or conference to attend conference, regional or national student-athlete advisory committee meetings.

This proposal is a result of a survey conducted during the spring of 1993 by the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee for the pur-

pose of identifying various student-athlete advisory committees on the institutional and conference levels. The majority of the institutions responding to the survey have student-athlete advisory committees. Those institutions that do not have student-athlete advisory committees are interested in forming such a committee. However, the majority of the conferences responding to the survey indicated they do not have student-athlete advisory committees.

The adoption of this proposal should further encourage institutions and conferences to develop student-athlete advisory committees on the conference and regional levels. The Council believes that student-athlete advisory committees should be encouraged and permitted to meet with student-athletes on the conference, regional or national levels. This proposal is consistent with the goal of having more knowledgeable student-athletes involved in the advisory and decision-making process on campuses and within conferences. Further, this proposal would help national student-athlete advisory committees with its networking project to keep student-athletes across the country better informed regarding current issues within the Association and provide a better understanding of what the majority of the student-athletes' opinions are regarding these issues. This proposal is consistent with the trend to advance the welfare of the student-athlete.

Finally, it should be noted that this proposal would be permissive legislation. Your institution or conference would not be required to provide such expenses. Please join the Council and the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee in support of this proposal.

Matt Leighninger (Haverford College/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): This is something of a historical occasion for us. This is the first time that a proposal that originated with the student-athletes on the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee has ever been introduced in the general session of the NCAA Convention.

When our committee considered all the issues that are important to student-athletes, all the potential changes that could be made, this idea was the one that we most wanted to advance. We chose to bring the conferences' student-athlete advisory committees to your attention because their powers will enhance the student's welfare and does not limit it to any one issue.

Dorothy Dreyer just told you this is permissive legislation and does not require a conference to form a committee. We expect the financial costs of the committees would be fairly small since most schools in a conference are within driving distance of one another and the students would stay in dormitories instead of hotels.

Conferences regularly make decisions that affect the lives of student-athletes. It would make sense that the student-athletes could help them. Even more importantly, however, conferences are the missing link to the NCAA for student representation. They can serve us more effectively on the individual campus and our national committee can bring the concerns of the students to this Convention. As

you have already heard, the student-athlete advisory committee in the Southeastern Conference and in Division III's Centennial Conference have begun to fill this role, allowing communications between schools as well as between a campus and this Convention.

We urge you not only to support this resolution but to use it to create student-athlete advisory committees in our conferences and on our campuses. Thank you very much.

[Proposal No. 132 (page A-168) was adopted.]

Budgetary Control

Karl D. Benson (Mid-American Athletic Conference): On behalf of the 10 executive officers of the Mid-American Conference, I move Proposal No. 147.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal, if adopted, will require all members to determine the actual expenses of conducting an intercollegiate athletics program and to disclose that information yearly on a standardized form developed by the Association and approved by the NCAA Council.

As the issues of gender equity and cost containment begin to shape the future of intercollegiate athletics, it becomes increasingly important for a member institution to produce a clearer and more accurate account of its athletics revenues and expenditures. We realize there are wide variations in most institutional budgeting processes and know that many institutions may report actual athletically related expenditures in general university and college accounts. So comparison of those conclusions are dubious at best. It should be noted that there are mounting state and Federal pressures based on gender for constant cost controls and accountability. Proposal No. 147 will move us toward greater accountability. This legislation will not be mandatory. It has been discussed in the Mid-American Athletic Conference. There is no doubt if the NCAA had adequate time it could develop a system that will address the various institutional and divisional needs.

The Research Committee has affirmed the value of such a standardized method of reporting and believes it will be useful to gather and publish the results in an aggregate form. I urge your approval of No. 147.

James M. O'Fallon (University of Oregon): I can't imagine a more valuable exercise to go through than once again filling out yet another form. There is no institution in this room that does not budget its athletics. I know the Presidents Commission would have a good deal of interest in anything that would enhance its ability to control intercollegiate athletics expenditures. It has not taken a position on this measure.

Frank R.A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): I hesitate to be repetitive, but given my experience at these Conventions, it is a pleasant opportunity to speak in support of a proposal. I stand in support of this particular proposal because as the university's fiscal officer I know about filling out budget forms. With regular

focus on revenue and especially expenditures in our athletics programs, I fill out lots of different forms—university forms, forms for our athletics board, forms for our trustees, forms for the conference, forms for the NCAA.

The key word in this proposal, however, is standardized. A well-developed, standardized form could be used to satisfy everyone's requirements. Standardized forms will ease the work of auditors and thereby reduce the costs of your required independent audits. The desire to know and the requirement to report athletically related revenues and expenditures will not go away. A standardized form will ease the burden. This is not the time to say who needs another form. This is the form that we do need. I urge your approval of Proposal No. 147.

Ray Hammond (Centre College): With due respect to the previous speaker, a standardized form will be very problematic for Division III institutions. Many of its members wear many hats. Our business office tells us which part of our salary comes from which pocket. To have a standardized form that would address the coaches and the administrators in Division I schools, as well as the coaches and administrators and teachers in Division III schools, would be very problematic. I would like to move to refer this to the appropriate committee for further development.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 147 (page A-181) to committee was seconded and adopted.]

Tobacco Products

Charles Cavagnaro (Memphis State University): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 149.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Cavagnaro: I also move Proposal No. 149-1, the purpose of which is to clean up a potential problem with enforcement. Proposal No. 149-1 makes clear to the student-athletes to quit using tobacco products during practice or competition, but will have the opportunity to return if tobacco-free for the next practice game.

[The motion was seconded.]

Speaking in favor of Proposal No. 149, as amended by Proposal No. 149-1, in 1991, the Executive Committee took a bold step to ban the use of tobacco products at NCAA championship events. It is time now to take the ban one step further and extend it to include all collegiate practices and games.

Initially, the competitive safeguards committee opposed the idea to ban tobacco products by NCAA legislation because of the issues involving consistent applications and enforcement. From a medical viewpoint, the committee, which includes physicians and sports medicine experts, has always supported the concept that tobacco should be banned at athletics events.

After reviewing the recent results of a national survey of collegiate commissioners, it showed that 75 percent wanted an NCAA ban on

the use of tobacco products. After considering the recommendations of other NCAA committees to institute a ban, the safeguards committee agreed that the passage of Proposal No. 149 is the best way to establish a uniform and strong rule against tobacco products by our student-athletes, our coaches and game officials during practice and competition.

For those reasons, the Council and the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports asks you to pass Proposal No. 149.

Kathy Clark (University of Idaho): I am chair of the competitive safeguards committee. We know that college student-athletes participate in a number of high-risk activities on and off the field. Education seems to be our best measure to prevent the unfortunate results of high-risk activities. Colleges have been leaders in educating students about high-risk activities. The NCAA has done its part to minimize the high-risk behavior of student-athletes.

Due to its drug-testing and drug-education program, the NCAA has seen the use of street drugs and performance-enhancing drugs decrease dramatically in the last eight years. In 1985, an NCAA study showed that 17 percent of our athletes were using cocaine. In 1993, these studies showed use was 1.1 percent. During the same period, marijuana use decreased from 35.3 to 21.4 percent. Although all of us wish these numbers were zero, we can be proud that our educational programs have had positive, lasting effects. An area of abuse where we have had little or no success in deterring is in the use of smokeless tobacco.

In 1993, 26.9 percent of the athletes involved in the NCAA substance-abuse studies reported the use of smokeless tobacco. That is up seven percentage points from 1985. We know that over three-fourths of the college student-athletes using smokeless tobacco started before they arrived on the college campus.

As a result, the NCAA focus has been placed on helping users quit. The production and dissemination by the NCAA of educational brochures has been a great first step. The ban on these substances at NCAA championships has always been very positive. Our educational programs, combined with an enforceable national banning of tobacco products for our student-athletes, coaches and officials at practices and games can break the "athletics-tobacco" bond that the tobacco industry created in the 1970s to imply that chewing tobacco was safer than smoking. We now know that is not so.

Participation in sports should not be a risk factor for tobacco addiction or oral cancer. We need to help them beat the smokeless tobacco habit. We can do that by passing Proposal No. 149, as amended.

Chris McGrew (University of New Mexico): I stand before you today as a representative of the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, as well as a medical doctor that serves on a team of physicians at universities.

Before my appointment to the competitive safeguards committee, my medical colleagues were successful in instituting a tobacco ban at NCAA championship events. The Executive Committee recognized that the use of tobacco products by student-athletes is a medical problem that could not be resolved by education alone. Today, I am asking for the entire NCAA membership to follow the advice of the sports medical advisors and extend the ban of tobacco throughout the year. Because of time constraints, I can't present to you graphics and comprehensives that illustrate the effects of chewing smokeless tobacco.

We are well aware of the scope of the problems caused by these products. However, from the standpoint of sports medicine and the health and welfare of our athletes, we should be reminded of the following points: Number one, smokeless tobacco and/or spitting tobacco causes oral cancer, gum disease, cholesterol problems, heart disease and high blood pressure, among other medical problems. Number two, 75 percent of devastating oral cancer is caused by the use of tobacco products. A devastating 50 percent of oral cancer victims will not survive five years. Number three, from 1985 to 1993, the use of smokeless tobacco by NCAA athletes jumped by 36 percent. A recent NCAA survey found that over 50 percent of college baseball players participating in this study are habitual users of smokeless tobacco. Seventy percent of those players were smokers of tobacco. Number four, confinement. Many medical experts across the country have encouraged the NCAA to help the membership adopt as well as encourage the ban on spitting tobacco.

As a physician, I am convinced the passage of this legislation is a critical step in safeguarding the health and welfare of our athletes. I urge your approval.

[Proposal No. 149-1 (page A-184) was adopted.]

[Proposal No. 149 (page A-183) was adopted as amended by No. 149-1.]

Committees—Term of Office

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): President Crowley, in his otherwise generous remarks in the opening business session, made some remarks about my tennis skills. I have been encouraged by mutual friends to make an appropriate response. While the remarks are not quite inflammatory, they were at least partially inaccurate, and hopefully provocative of additional competition. However, I have decided to refrain from making any response and let the facts speak for themselves.

President Crowley: I find no fault with that, sir. (Laughter)

Mr. Gibbens: Unrelated to that, I move adoption of Proposal No. 150.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is one of the major changes in the NCAA committee process. It was developed by the Committee on Review and Planning. I served as the Council representative on that committee.

One of the major concerns often expressed by those of you in the membership regarding NCAA committee structure is that it is too

difficult to get appointed, that there is just not enough opportunities to serve. This is an attempt to address that concern.

This has established applicable four-year terms for all committees, as contrasted to the current practice of two consecutive three-year terms. In other words, four years instead of six. There are exceptions specified in the current legislation, such as on the Committee on Infractions and the Executive Committee.

On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Review and Planning, I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 150 (page A-185) was adopted.]

Sports Committees

Kenneth A. Free (Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Executive Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 151.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal resulted from the Executive Committee's 18-month study of the NCAA championship program. It is an effort to provide representation of the membership on these nine sports committees and to assist the committees with increasing administrative and championship responsibilities. It also provides more consistency in the composition and size of sports committees across the board.

The cost of additional members' travel and per diem at championships is estimated at \$45,000. On behalf of the Executive Committee, I urge your approval of Proposal No. 151.

[Proposal No. 151 (page A-185) was adopted.]

Enforcement—Mission Statement

Robert M. Sweazy (Texas Tech University): On behalf of the Special Committee to Review the NCAA Penalty Structure and the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 152.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the request of the NCAA Committee on Infractions and the Council, a special committee was formed to review the NCAA penalty structure. Proposal Nos. 152 through 156 are the results.

Regarding No. 152, the committee believes it is important for the enforcement procedures to include a mission statement. We believe that the mission statement should be consistent with the current objectives of the enforcement staff and the Committee on Infractions. As you may be aware, there has been considerable discussion related to the effect of penalties on individuals and institutions that are not directly involved in violations. A special committee concluded that institutional penalties remain important to the penalty structure, but the last statement of the mission statement is intended to clarify that when penalties are imposed, that it is important to consider the effect of the penalties on those not involved in the violations, as well as to consider the interest of competitors and institutions that did not violate the rule. I urge your support of No. 152.

[Proposal No. 152 (page A-187) was adopted.]

Enforcement—Secondary and Major Violations

Mr. Sweazy: On behalf of the Special Committee to Review the

NCAA Penalty Structure and the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 153.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal moves one sentence from the definition of a major violation to the definition of a secondary violation for clarification purposes. It also clarifies the Committee on Infractions' authority to impose major penalties in cases where repeated secondary violations have occurred without the institution taking the appropriate action to prevent such violations. I urge your support of Proposal No. 153.

[Proposal No. 153 (page A-187) was adopted.]

Enforcement—Secondary Violations

Mr. Sweazy: On behalf of the Special Committee to Review the NCAA Penalty Structure and the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 154.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal assures the flexibility for the Committee on Infractions to impose penalties for secondary violations. Such penalties can include suspension of the head coach or staff members for one or more competitions, public reprimands and show-cause action that could affect an athletics department staff member who has been found in violation of NCAA rules at another institution.

The proposal also states explicitly that institutional or conference penalties can be accepted as satisfactory. Again, I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 154 (page A-188) was adopted.]

Enforcement—Major Violations

Mr. Sweazy: On behalf of the Special Committee to Review the NCAA Penalty Structure and the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 155.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would also like to move the adoption of the amendment-to-the-amendment, No. 155-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the view of the Council, this amendment is necessary to clarify the Infractions Appeals Committee's ability to evaluate the penalties imposed by the Committee on Infractions. That point was not discussed by the special committee. It was our intention simply to provide flexibility to the Committee on Infractions.

[Proposal No. 155-1 (page A-191) was adopted.]

Mr. Sweazy: With respect to the amended motion, the special committee has proposed that the current prescribed list of penalties for a major case, which can be changed on the basis of uniqueness, should be changed to a list of presumptive penalties.

The practical effect is to permit the Committee on Infractions to explain its reasoning for imposing or not imposing a specified list of penalties. This list of presumptive penalties will not prohibit the imposition of additional penalties and assist in defining penalties that

correspond to the abuses that are found. We urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 155 (page A-189) was adopted as amended by 155-1.]

COMMITTEE REPORTS

[Note: The delegates heard the reports of the Men's and Women's Committees on Committees and the Nominating Committee. The delegates approved the slate of candidates presented by the Nominating Committee.]

President Crowley: Ladies and gentlemen, as we recognize the new officers and the new Council members, let me also take a moment to pay tribute to those who are leaving the Council. Your Division I Vice-President, Elaine Dreidame, and Division III Vice-President, John Harvey.

A number of outstanding Council members are also leaving us at this time. They include Ollie Bowman, Hampton University; Charles Cavagnaro, Memphis State University; Irwin Cohen, Northeastern; Dorothy Dreyer of Wayne State University in Detroit; Dan Gibbens, the great tennis player from Oklahoma; Marjorie Giles, Central College of Iowa; Jim Malik, San Diego State University; Sandra Weeden of Stony Brook, and Wayne Wright of Pepperdine. They all have served us well. It would be appropriate to acknowledge them. (Applause)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Enforcement—Repeat Violators

Robert M. Sweazy (Texas Tech University): On behalf of the Special Committee to Review the NCAA Penalty Structure and the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 156.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is intended to provide flexibility in designing the penalties to fit the crime in cases involving repeat major violators. Thank goodness, the proposal eliminates the term "unique."

[Proposal No. 156 (page A-192) was adopted.]

NCAA Infractions Appeals Committee

Robert G. Bottoms (DePauw University): I move Proposal No. 157.

[The motion was seconded.]

Many of us on our campuses have committees that don't meet. They sit there for a really good reason or for major issues such as censure or dismissal.

It is my understanding that the Council is going to rewrite the original legislation to include a special setup that will handle any Division II or Division III cases that may want to be appealed. But for the upcoming 1994 year, if this is not passed, there will be no mechanism in place that could help Division II and Division III. I would urge the body to put this in place knowing that it may turn out to be redundant because we don't need it. There will be no cases. But just in case, it would be nice to have it sitting there for Divisions II and III.

Michael L. Slive (Great Midwest Conference): The Infractions Appeals Committee has been operational for less than a year. It has heard only one case. We are continuing to refine our procedures for appeals from decisions of the Committee on Infractions and in major infractions cases.

It was the committee's thought that rather than creating three different appeals committees at this time with the potential for different procedures, it makes sense to consider this in other ways to provide representation for Divisions II and III in the appeals process. The Council agreed to withdraw the proposal, subject to the understanding that Divisions II and III will be represented in the process.

In response to the mover's point, in this transition from the Council as an "appeals" body to the Infractions Appeals Committee, we have provided adequate time for appeals cases to be held until appropriate mechanisms are in place. We did that in Division I. We can do that for a Division II or Division III case. I think we can assure the proper kind of representation for all the divisions.

[Proposal No. 157 (page A-193) was defeated.]

Minimum Sponsorship Requirements—Championships

Joan C. Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I move Proposal No. 158.

[The motion was seconded.]

As you are aware, last summer the Executive Committee directed a review of NCAA championship programs that included two extensive membership surveys and resulted in several basic changes in the administration of championships and the size of fields for select men's and women's events.

We believe that Proposal No. 158, regarding the requirements of continuation of an NCAA championship, reflects this. I urge on behalf of the Executive Committee that we pass Proposal No. 158.

Jenepher P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): I rise to a point of concern. If this legislation is passed, it will eliminate championship opportunities for as many as 20 field hockey teams in Division II in 1995.

There are 27 Division II teams. That is an increase of three teams from last year. Without a championship, these teams may play up into Division I. The next proposal will enhance that opportunity if you pass it. At the moment, they may not play down into Division III.

The Executive Committee has indicated that it will propose legislation allowing Division II to play down in III. I can assure you that will not be very popular for Division III institutions. I would suggest that this piece of legislation does not enhance gender equity. In fact, it diminishes some opportunities in response to head count.

[Proposal No. 158 (page A-194) was adopted.]

Multidivision Classification

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): I move Proposal No. 159.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will provide an opportunity for Division II institutions that classify one sport in Division I to classify additional sports in Division I if no specific championship opportunities exist at the Division II level.

Specifically, this will provide championship opportunities for Division II institutions in field hockey, men's ice hockey and men's lacrosse, as well as other Division II championships that might be discontinued due to low sponsorship numbers. On behalf of the Executive Committee, I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 159 (page A-197) was adopted.]

Championships—Automatic Qualification

R. Daniel Beebe (Ohio Valley Conference): I move, on behalf of the Ohio Valley Conference, Proposal No. 160.

[The motion was seconded.]

I appreciate your attention at this late hour to a very critical and important matter to many student-athletes, coaches and fans in our communities and others in the NCAA. I would like to explain and expand on some of the points in the rationale statements and address the position of opposition taken by the Executive Committee to this proposal.

The Ohio Valley Conference has had a long and successful history of Division I membership and automatic qualification status into the Division I men's basketball tournament. A couple of years ago, the conference admitted two fine institutions in the region—Southeast Missouri State and the University of Tennessee, Martin. Their athletics programs and missions had developed to the same level as OVC members. The OVC did not have to add schools. It chose to at this time because Southeast Missouri and Tennessee-Martin provide competition from very close and similar institutions. The marriage has been great for all sports and the student-athletes, except for the extreme hardship of the effects of the eight-year rule in the sport of men's basketball.

The current rule cripples recruiting efforts and polarizes these schools and student-athletes in a conference that they belong to due to their location and institutional mission. It robs their fans and student-athletes of the opportunity to compete in the conference tournament. The committee's position to oppose the proposed amendment centers upon an institution demonstrating a commitment to Division I. The committee has taken the position in regard to only one NCAA championship—men's basketball. There must be a time commitment of eight years. That is in addition to the commitment to Division I criteria. I submit that time has little or nothing to do with an institution and its community's commitment to a particular sport. The type of commitment reflected in these institutions with more than 100 scholarships in each institution devoted to intercollegiate athletics is more significant than in many institutions. Although I don't believe that a specific amount of time is significant reflection of a commitment, it is important to note that the proposed

amendment does not eliminate the eight-year rule. The amendment would still leave intact the requirement that an institution joining Division I would not be eligible for automatic qualification if it did not join a conference that had an automatic bid for eight previous consecutive years.

So the conference itself must have a bid for eight years, plus this amendment does not require additional revenue distribution. On behalf of the sponsors, I encourage your support of this amendment.

Phyllis L. Howlett (Big Ten Conference): On behalf of the Executive Committee, I want to urge your defeat of Proposal No. 160.

The Executive Committee, the Division I Championships Committee and the Division I Men's Basketball Committee are opposed to this proposal. The entire issue of automatic qualification into the Division I Men's Basketball Championships, as well as the related matters of the membership structure and movement into Division I, has been studied extensively over the past few years by numerous committees and subcommittees.

The current regulations reflect decisively the philosophy and intent of these bodies. Only those institutions that have made at least one, eight-year commitment to Division I and to the Division I basketball championships are eligible to automatically qualify. I urge your defeat of Proposal No. 160.

Robert E. Frederick (University of Kansas): On behalf of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee, I encourage you to defeat Proposal No. 160. The committee has reviewed the automatic qualification legislation on several occasions in recent years. Each time it has voted to oppose any change in the original intent of the legislation, as just described by Ms. Howlett. The committee supports the Executive Committee's position on this matter and urges you to defeat Proposal No. 160.

[Proposal No. 160 (page A-197) was defeated.]

Championships—Mixed Team

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Council, it is my privilege to move Proposal No. 161, the last proposal of this great Convention.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to modify the definition of a mixed team to indicate that such a team is one on which at least one individual of each gender actually competes as opposed to being eligible to compete.

Recently, the Interpretations Committee's interpretation was to permit institutions to allow males to practice with the women's teams and vice versa under certain conditions. Thus, it is necessary to amend the current definition of a mixed team to permit such practice to occur without causing the team to be considered a mixed one. I urge you to support Proposal No. 161.

[Proposal No. 161 (page A-199) was adopted.]

CLOSING REMARKS

President Crowley: Is there any further business to come before this Convention?

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I simply would like to say on behalf of the Convention, thank you for handling a very excellent meeting. (Applause)

President Crowley: Thank you very much. It is 5:30. We have finished our business a half hour ahead of time. I congratulate you and take pleasure in informing you that this Convention is adjourned.

[The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.]

Appendix A

88th Annual Convention LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposed amendments shall be effective as indicated; the term "Immediately" means that the legislation, if adopted, becomes effective upon adjournment of the Convention. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1993-94 NCAA Manual. All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments upon which the 88th annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments-to-amendments immediately follow the proposal to which they relate.*]

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 88th ANNUAL CONVENTION

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
1 through 10	Consent Package
11 through 53	Presidents Commission Grouping
54 through 61	Personnel
62 through 78	Eligibility
79 through 92	Financial Aid
93 through 119	Playing and Practice Seasons
120 through 132	Awards/Expenses/Amateurism
133 through 146;	Recruiting
162 through 173	
147 through 151	General
152 through 157	Enforcement
158 through 161	Championships

Consent Package

Proposals 1 through 10 are offered as a "consent package" of amendments considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon with a single vote, requiring a two-thirds majority approval for adoption inasmuch as the package contains certain dominant provisions.

NO. 1 (NO. 2-4) VACANCIES — NCAA COUNCIL

Intent: To specify that interim appointments to the NCAA Council are for the remainder of the term of the individual being replaced, rather than only until the next Convention.

Constitution: Amend 4.1.4.4, page 18, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"4.1.4.4 Vacancies. When a vacancy occurs on the Council, the Council, by a majority vote, may fill the unexpired term. *The person so elected shall serve until the next annual Convention.* Members appointed to fill vacancies shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of that term."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Review and Planning).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This will make the procedures related to interim appointments to the Council consistent with all other NCAA committees.

Action: Nos. 1 through 10 were adopted as a consent package.

NO. 2 (NO. 2-6) AMENDMENT-TO-AMENDMENT AND RESOLUTION — SPONSORSHIP

Intent: To specify that an amendment-to-amendment or a resolution sponsored by a conference must be signed by the chair of the conference's official presidential administrative group or at least two chief executive officers of the conference's member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative group.

A. Constitution: Amend 5.3.2.2, page 33, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.3.2.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. An amendment to an amendment of a provision of the constitution or bylaws may be sponsored by:

[5.3.2.2-(a) through 5.3.2.2-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) A member conference with voting privileges when submitted in writing by the chief elected or executive officer of the conference or any of the conference's voting and alternate Convention delegates on behalf of eight or more of its active member institutions **and signed by the chair of the conference's official presidential administrative group or at least two chief executive officers of the conference's member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative group, or**"

[Remainder of 5.3.2.2 unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend 5.4.2.3, page 38, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.4.2.3 Sponsorship. A resolution may be sponsored by:

[5.4.2.3-(a) through 5.4.2.3-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Eight or more active member institutions with voting privileges, upon written verification of sponsorship signed by each sponsoring member's chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative **and signed by the chair of the conference's official presidential administrative group or at least two chief executive officers of the conference's member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative group, or**"

[Remainder of 5.4.2.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal makes the procedures related to the conference submission of amendments-to-amendments and resolutions consistent with the procedures related to the submission of amendments.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 3 (NO. 2-7) PROPOSED LEGISLATION — SPONSORSHIP

Intent: To delete references to voting and alternate Convention delegates from the legislation related to the submission of amendments-to-amendments and resolutions.

A. Bylaws: Amend 5.3.2.2, page 33, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.3.2.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. An amendment to an amendment of a provision of the constitution or bylaws may be sponsored by:

[5.3.2.2-(a) through 5.3.2.2-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Eight or more active member institutions with voting privileges when submitted in writing by each institution's chief executive officer, **or** the chief executive officer's designated representative *or any of the institution's voting and alternate Convention delegates;*

"(e) A member conference with voting privileges when submitted in writing by the chief elected or executive officer of the conference *or any of the conference's voting and alternate Convention delegates on behalf of eight or more of its active member institutions, or*"

[Remainder of 5.3.2.2 unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend 5.4.2.3, page 38, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.4.2.3 Sponsorship. A resolution may be sponsored by:

[5.4.2.3-(a) through 5.4.2.3-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) A member conference with voting privileges when submitted by the chief elected or executive officer of the conference **or**

any of the conference's voting and alternate Convention delegates on behalf of eight or more of its active member institutions."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: It no longer is necessary to permit voting and alternate Convention delegates to submit amendments-to-amendments or resolutions on behalf of an institution or conference, inasmuch as the deadline for the submission of amendments-to-amendments and resolutions is the October 15 prior to the Convention.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 4 (NO. 2-23) LIMITED REPLACEMENT OF COACHING STAFF MEMBER

Intent: To permit the Council to approve the limited replacement of a coaching staff member when the coach is unable to perform some aspect of his or her coaching duties due to extenuating circumstances.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.1.1.1.2, page 55, as follows:
[Division I only]

"11.7.1.1.1.2 Replacement Due to Extenuating Circumstances. Subject to Council approval, an institution may replace temporarily or on a limited basis one of its countable coaches if the coach is unable to perform any or all of his or her duties because of extenuating circumstances beyond the coach's control (e.g., suspension, prolonged serious illness, pregnancy). A replaced **The replacement** coach is precluded from may performing any only those coaching, administrative or recruiting duties, including the telephoning of prospective student-athletes, that the replaced coach is unable to perform."

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The replacement of a coaching staff member who is unable to perform only a limited portion of his or her duties currently is prohibited by NCAA legislation. These requests have been approved by the NCAA Administrative Review Panel, however. The adoption of this proposal would create greater institutional flexibility and a more uniform application of NCAA legislation in response to such situations.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 5 (NO. 2-37) RECRUITING CONTACTS — WRITTEN PERMISSION

Intent: To permit student-athletes to receive institutional financial aid upon transfer to the certifying Division III institution, even if they did not receive prior permission to discuss the transfer with the institution.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.1.3, pages 80-81, as follows:
[Division III only]

"13.1.1.3 Four-Year College Prospects. An athletics staff member or other representative of the institution's athletics interests shall not make contact with the student-athlete of another four-year collegiate institution, directly or indirectly, without first obtaining the written permission of the first institution's athletics director (or an athletics administrator designated by the athletics director) to do so, regardless of who makes the initial contact. If permission is not granted, the second institution shall not encourage the transfer and shall not provide financial assistance to the student-athlete until the student-athlete has attended the second institution for one academic year. If permission is granted to contact the student-athlete, all applicable NCAA recruiting rules apply."
[Remainder of 13.1.1.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Present legislation, which requires an institution to withhold financial aid from a transfer student who does not receive permission to discuss a possible transfer, is very difficult to apply in Division III. Communication regarding potential transfer students typically does not occur between the athletics department and the financial aid office because no athletics aid is awarded by the institution.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 6 (NO. 2-65) ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who has utilized the discontinued/ nonsponsored sport exception to the transfer residence requirement to subsequently utilize the one-time transfer exception to the transfer residence requirement, provided all other conditions of the one-time transfer exception are met.

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.5.3.10, page 151, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.6.5.3.10 One-Time Transfer Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year collegiate institution and all of the following conditions are met:

[14.6.5.3.10-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) The student has not transferred previously from one four-year institution to another four-year institution, **unless, in the previous transfer, the student-athlete received an exception per 14.6.5.3.6 (discontinued/nonsponsored sport exception);**"

[Remainder of 14.6.5.3.10 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Review Panel).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The prior use of the discontinued/nonsponsored sport exception should not adversely affect a student-athlete's future ability to use the one-time transfer exception.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 7 (NO. 2-69) OUTSIDE COMPETITION

Intent: To confirm that the Eligibility Committee may restore a student-athlete's eligibility prior to the expiration of the full period of ineligibility specified in the Association's outside-competition legislation.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.8.1.1, page 152, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.8.1.1 Division I. In Division I, a student-athlete in any sport other than basketball who participates during the academic year as a member of any outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition becomes ineligible for intercollegiate competition in that sport for the remainder of the year and for the next academic year (see 14.8.5 and 14.8.6 for exceptions and waivers), **unless restored to eligibility prior to that time by the NCAA Eligibility Committee.** A student-athlete is permitted to practice on such a team."

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.8.1.2, page 152, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"14.8.1.2 Divisions II and III. A Division II or III student-athlete ~~shall be denied eligibility~~ **becomes ineligible** for intercollegiate competition for the remainder of the season in his or her sport (other than basketball) if, following enrollment in college and during any year in which the student-athlete is a member of an intercollegiate squad or team, he or she competes or has competed as a member of any outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., tournament play, exhibition games or other activity) during the institution's intercollegiate season in the sport (see 14.8.5 and 14.8.6 for exceptions and waivers), **unless restored to eligibility prior to that time by the NCAA Eligibility Committee.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This legislation clarifies the fact that the Eligibility Committee has the authority to restore a student-athlete's eligibility prior to the end of the period of ineligibility specified in the legislation prohibiting outside competition. The committee believes it is important to have this authority specified in the outside-competition legislation.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 8 (NO. 2-144) MEN'S AND WOMEN'S COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Intent: To specify that the Men's and Women's Committees on Committees each shall include at least three ethnic minorities, with at least one from each division.

A. Bylaws: Amend 21.2.1.1, page 350, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.2.1.1 Composition. The Men's Committee on Committees shall consist of 12 members, **including at least three ethnic minorities, with at least one from each division.** There shall be at least one member from each of the eight geographical districts. Six members shall be from Division I, three from Division II and three from Division III."

B. Bylaws: Amend 21.2.2.1, page 350, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.2.2.1 Composition. The Women's Committee on Committees shall consist of 12 members, **including at least three ethnic minorities, with at least one from each division.** There shall be at least one member from each of the eight geographical districts. Six members shall be from Division I, three from Division II and three from Division III."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Review and Planning).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: There appears to be widespread interest in the membership in NCAA committee service and appointment opportunities. There also are concerns regarding access to committee service on the one hand and assuring necessary committee expertise and experience on the other. These changes are recommended to improve the process of identifying qualified candidates for committee service, to make committee service more readily available to more candidates, and to assure greater attention to representation for ethnic minorities and women.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 9 (NO. 2-145) NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Intent: To specify that there shall be at least five men and five women on the Nominating Committee; to eliminate the requirement that at least one committee member be from each of the eight geographical districts; to specify that committee membership must include at least one ethnic minority from Divisions I, II and III (each); to require that eight of the committee members be former NCAA officers or Council members, and to specify that committee members are limited to two (as opposed to three) terms in any five-year period.

Bylaws: Amend 21.2.9, page 351, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.2.9 Nominating Committee

"21.2.9.1 Composition. The Nominating Committee shall consist of 16 members, including at least ~~four~~ **five** women, **one from each division, and five men, one from each division.**

"21.2.9.1.1 Geographical and Division Representation. *There shall be at least one member from each of the eight geographical districts* Eight members, including at least **one ethnic minority** and two women, shall be from Division I, two from each of the Council representation regions in that division; four, including at least **one ethnic minority** and one woman, from Division II, one from each of the Council representation regions in that division, and four, including at least **one ethnic minority** and one woman, from Division III, one from each of the Council representation regions in that division.

"21.2.9.1.2 Council Representation. **Eight of the members must be former NCAA officers or former members of the Council, four from Division I and two each from Divisions II and III.** Four of the members shall be Council members whose terms do not expire that year, two from Division I and one each from Divisions II and III, *the other 12 members shall not be members of the Council or officers of the Association.*

[21.2.9.2 unchanged.]

"21.2.9.3 Term of Office. Members shall serve one-year terms, commencing with their appointments, and shall be limited to ~~three~~ **two** terms in any five-year period."

[Remainder of 21.2.9 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Review and Planning).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale. This proposal will help to ensure that the Nominating Committee gives greater consideration to the interests of women and ethnic minorities when it nominates candidates for service on the Council or as NCAA officers.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 10 (NO. 2-146) ELIGIBILITY COMMITTEE — DUTIES

Intent: To clarify that the Eligibility Committee has the authority to restore eligibility immediately, to restore eligibility at a subsequent time, to impose conditions upon restoration of eligibility or to determine that eligibility should not be restored.

Bylaws: Amend 21.3.11.2, page 355, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.11.2 Duties. The committee shall have *initial* **the** authority under Bylaw 14.14 to determine all matters pertaining to the eligibility of student-athletes at NCAA member institutions to engage in intercollegiate

athletics competition, and to act upon all appeals concerning the eligibility of student-athletes submitted by member institutions in accordance with the provisions of 14.14. It shall apply the rules of eligibility established by the Association, provided such application is in accordance with the published and circulated interpretations of the Council concerning the constitution and bylaws of the Association **policies and procedures for the restoration of eligibility of a student-athlete who is ineligible for intercollegiate competition as a result of an NCAA rules violation, and for waivers of legislation that the Council or the membership has authorized the committee to grant. The procedures for processing such appeals or requests shall be established by the Eligibility Committee and approved by the Council. The committee may restore eligibility immediately, may restore eligibility at a subsequent time or may determine that eligibility should not be restored. The committee also may impose conditions for restoration of eligibility."**

[Remainder of 21.3.11.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Eligibility Committee believes that it is important to clarify the duties of the committee by specifying that it may restore eligibility immediately, may restore eligibility at a subsequent time, may impose conditions for restoration of eligibility or may determine that eligibility should not be restored.

Action: See No. 1.

Presidents Commission Grouping

The Presidents Commission designated the following 43 proposals for placement at this point in the agenda. Please note that inclusion of a proposal in this grouping does not constitute a position by the Commission for or against the proposal; rather, the proposals are placed here because the Commission believes that they are of particular interest to chief executive officers. The only proposals officially sponsored by the Commission are identified with an asterisk before the proposal number. Please note also that the Commission has designated all 43 proposals in this grouping for roll-call votes.

*NO. 11 (NO. 2-1) PRINCIPLE OF GENDER EQUITY

Intent: To establish a principle of gender equity in the Association's principles for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics.

Constitution: Amend Constitution 2 by adding new 2.3, page 3, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"2.3 THE PRINCIPLE OF GENDER EQUITY

"2.3.1 Compliance With Federal and State Legislation. It is the responsibility of each member institution to

comply with Federal and state laws regarding gender equity.

"2.3.2 NCAA Legislation. The Association should not adopt legislation that would prevent member institutions from complying with applicable gender-equity laws, and should adopt legislation to enhance member institutions' compliance with applicable gender-equity laws.

"2.3.3 Gender Bias. The activities of the Association should be conducted in a manner free of gender bias."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Gender-Equity Task Force).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Association asserts the value of equitable participation and treatment of men and women in intercollegiate athletics through its structure, programs, legislation and policies. It is the responsibility of the Association to act affirmatively to assure equity in the quality and quantity of participation in women's athletics. It is important that at the institutional level, gender equity in intercollegiate athletics describes an environment in which fair and equitable distribution of overall athletics opportunities, benefits and resources is available to men and women, and in which student-athletes, coaches and athletics administrators are not subject to gender-based discrimination. An athletics program can be considered gender equitable when the participants in both the men's and women's sports programs would accept as fair and equitable the overall program of the other gender. The adoption of a principle of gender equity will help to ensure that no individual will be discriminated against on the basis of gender in intercollegiate athletics.

Action: Adopted (804-1)

***NO. 12 (NO. 2-85) SPORTS SPONSORSHIP —
EMERGING SPORTS FOR WOMEN**

Intent: To establish maximum financial aid limits in emerging sports for women and to permit institutions to utilize the emerging sports in order to meet the Association's minimum sports-sponsorship and financial aid award criteria.

A. Bylaws: Amend 20.02 by adding new 20.02.4, page 323, as follows:
[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"20.02.4 Emerging Sports for Women. The following shall be considered emerging sports for women and countable for purposes of revenue distribution (i.e., for sports sponsorship and grants-in-aid):

"(a) Team Sports: Crew, ice hockey, team handball, water polo and synchronized swimming, and

"(b) Individual Sports: Archery, badminton, bowling and squash.

"20.02.4.1 Additional Emerging Sports. The NCAA Council periodically shall identify future emerging sports for women that shall be countable sports for revenue distribution and minimum sports sponsorship criteria and shall establish procedures to determine minimum contests and maximum grants in those sports."

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.2, page 182, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5.3.2 Division I Maximum Equivalency Limits — Women's Sports. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.3.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the following Division I women's sports:

Archery	5	Squash	9
Badminton	8	Synchronized Swimming	5
Bowling	5	Team Handball	12
Crew	20	Water Polo	8"
Ice Hockey	18		

[Remainder of 15.5.3.2 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.4, page 183, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"15.5.3.4 There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.3.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in each Division II sport, as follows:

Women's Sports			
Archery	5	Squash	9
Badminton	8	Synchronized Swimming	5
Bowling	5	Team Handball	12
Crew	20	Water Polo	8"
Ice Hockey	18		

[Remainder of 15.5.3.4 unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.1.2 by adding new 20.9.1.2.5, page 332, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"20.9.1.2.5 Emerging Sports. Financial aid awarded to student-athletes in those emerging sports for women, as defined in 20.02.4, may be counted in reaching the appropriate financial aid minimum requirements as well as for revenue distribution."

E. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.3, pages 333-335, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"20.9.3 Sports Sponsorship. A member of Division I shall sponsor in Division I a minimum of:

"(a) Seven varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, based on the minimum requirements of 20.9.3.3 and involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females, and seven varsity intercollegiate sports **(of which a maximum of two emerging sports per 20.02.4 may be utilized)**, including at least two team sports, based on the minimum requirements of 20.9.3.3 and involving all-female teams; or

"(b) Six varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, based on the minimum requirements of 20.9.3.3 and involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females, and eight varsity intercollegiate sports **(of which a maximum of two emerging sports per 20.02.4 may be utilized)**, including at least two team sports, based on the minimum requirements of 20.9.3.3 and involving all-female teams.

[20.9.3.1 unchanged.]

"20.9.3.2 Acceptable Sports. The sports designated to meet the sports sponsorship criteria shall:

"(a) Be among those in which the Association sponsors a championship **or emerging sports for women (per 20.02.4)**, and

[Remainder of 20.9.3.2 unchanged.]

"20.9.3.3 Minimum Contests and Participants Requirements for Sports Sponsorship. In each sport, the institution's team shall engage in at least a minimum number of intercollegiate contests (against four-year, degree-granting collegiate institutions) each year. In the individual sports, the institution's team shall include a minimum number of participants in each contest that is counted toward meeting the minimum-contests requirement. The following minimums are applicable:

		Minimum Contests
Team Sports		6
Women's Crew		25
Men's Ice Hockey		20
Women's Ice Hockey		8
Women's Synchronized Swimming		10
Women's Team Handball		15
Men's Water Polo		10
Women's Water Polo		
Individual Sports		Minimum Contests
Women's Archery		8
Women's Badminton		8
Women's Bowling		8
Women's Squash		8
		Minimum Participants
		5
		6
		5
		9"

[Remainder of 20.9.3 unchanged.]

F. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.6.1, page 336, as follows:

[Division I-A football only, roll call]

"20.9.6.1 Sports Sponsorship. The institution shall sponsor in Division I a minimum of:

[20.9.6.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Seven varsity intercollegiate sports **(of which a maximum of two emerging sports per 20.02.4 may be utilized)**, based on the minimum requirements of 20.9.3 and 20.9.3.3 and involving all-female teams, subject to the waiver provision in 20.9.3.1."

G. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.7.1, page 338, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only, roll call]

"20.9.7.1 Sports Sponsorship. The institution shall sponsor in Division I a minimum of:

[20.9.7.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Seven varsity intercollegiate sports **(of which a maximum of two emerging sports per 20.02.4 may be utilized)** based on the minimum requirements of 20.9.3 and 20.9.3.3 and involving all-female teams, subject to the waiver provision in 20.9.3.1."

H. Bylaws: Amend 20.10.3, pages 339-341, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"20.10.3 Sports Sponsorship. A member of Division II shall sponsor in Division II a minimum of:

[20.10.3-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Four varsity intercollegiate sports **(of which a maximum of two emerging sports per 20.02.4 may be utilized)**, including at least two team sports, based on the minimum requirements of 20.10.3.5 and involving all-female teams.

[20.10.3.1 through 20.10.3.3 unchanged.]

"20.10.3.4 Acceptable Sports. The sports designated to meet the sports sponsorship criteria shall:

"(a) Be among those in which the Association sponsors a championship **or emerging sports for women (per 20.02.4)**, and

[Remainder of 20.10.3.4 unchanged.]

"20.10.3.5 Minimum Contests and Participants Requirements for Sports Sponsorship. In each sport, the institution's team shall engage in at least a minimum number of intercollegiate contests (against four-year, degree-granting collegiate institutions) each year. In the individual sports, the institution's team shall include a minimum number of participants in each contest that is counted toward meeting the minimum-contest requirement. The following minimums are applicable:

"Team Sports	Minimum Contests
Women's Crew	6
Men's Ice Hockey	20
Women's Ice Hockey	20
Women's Synchronized Swimming	8
Women's Team Handball	10
Men's Water Polo	12
Women's Water Polo	10

Individual Sports	Minimum Contests	Minimum Participants
Women's Archery	8	5
Women's Badminton	8	6
Women's Bowling	8	5
Women's Squash	8	9"

[Remainder of 20.10.3 unchanged.]

I. Bylaws: Amend 20.11.3, pages 343-345, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"20.11.3 Sports Sponsorship. A member of Division III shall sponsor in Division III a minimum of:

[20.11.3-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Four varsity intercollegiate sports (of which a maximum of two emerging sports per 20.02.4 may be utilized), including at least two team sports, based on the minimum requirements of 20.10.3.5 and involving all-female teams.

"20.11.3.1 Acceptable Sports. The sports designated to meet the sports sponsorship criteria shall:

[20.11.3.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Be among those in which the Association sponsors a championship or emerging sports for women (per 20.02.4), and

[Remainder of 20.11.3.1 unchanged.]

"20.11.3.2 Minimum Contests and Participants Requirements for Sports Sponsorship. In each sport, the institution's team shall engage in at least a minimum number of intercollegiate contests (against four-year, degree-granting collegiate institutions) each year. In the individual sports, the institution's team shall include a minimum number of participants in each contest that is counted toward meeting the minimum-contest requirement. The following minimums are applicable:

"Team Sports	Minimum Contests
Women's Crew	6

Men's Ice Hockey	12
Women's Ice Hockey	20
Women's Synchronized Swimming	8
Women's Team Handball	10
Men's Water Polo	12
Women's Water Polo	10

Individual Sports	Minimum Contests	Minimum Participants
Women's Archery	8	5
Women's Badminton	8	6
Women's Bowling	8	5
Women's Squash	8	9"

[Remainder of 20.11.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Gender-Equity Task Force).

Effective Date: September 1, 1994.

Rationale: The incorporation of the identified emerging sports for women will help institutions reach minimum sports sponsorship criteria more easily. Additionally, the identification of these sports will create more opportunities for participation by female student-athletes without reducing the amount of opportunities for their male counterparts.

Action: Part A adopted by Division III (233-8, one abstention). Parts A, B, D and E adopted by Division I (314-10, one abstention). Parts A, C and H as amended by 12-1 adopted by Division II (187-6). Part F adopted by Division I-A (108-3, two abstentions). Part G adopted by Division I-AA (106-1, two abstentions). Part I referred to the NCAA Council by Division III (202-66, three abstentions).

NO. 12-1

**SPORTS SPONSORSHIP —
EMERGING SPORTS FOR WOMEN**

Intent: To preclude Division II institutions from utilizing emerging sports to meet minimum sports-sponsorship requirements.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 12-H, 20.10.3, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"20.10.3 Sports Sponsorship. A member of Division II shall sponsor in Division II a minimum of:

[20.10.3-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Four varsity intercollegiate sports (of which a maximum of two emerging sports per 20.02.4 may be utilized), including at least two team sports based on the minimum requirements of 20.10.3.5 and involving all-female teams.

[20.10.3.1 through 20.10.3.3 unchanged.]

"20.10.3.4 Acceptable Sports. The sports designated to meet the sports sponsorship criteria shall:

"(a) Be among those in which the Association sponsors a championship or emerging sports for women (per 20.02.4), and
[Remainder of 20.10.3.4 unchanged.]

"20.10.3.5 Minimum Contests and Participants Requirements for Sports Sponsorship. In each sport, the institution's team shall engage in at least a minimum number of intercollegiate contests (against four-year, degree-granting collegiate institutions) each year. In the individual sports, the institution's team shall include a minimum number of participants in each contest that is counted toward meeting the minimum-contest requirement. The following minimums are applicable:

	Minimum Contests		Minimum Contests	Minimum Participants
Team Sports	6	Individual Sports	8	5
Women's Crew	20	Women's Archery	8	6
Men's Ice Hockey	20	Women's Badminton	8	5
Women's Ice Hockey	8	Women's Bowling	8	9
Women's Synchronized Swimming	10	Women's Squash	8	
Women's Team Handball	12			
Men's Water Polo	10			
Women's Water Polo				

[Remainder of 20.10.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Rationale: The proposed legislation, unamended, would permit an institution to meet the Division II sports sponsorship requirements by sponsoring as few as two existing traditional sports in which the Association conducts championships. The use of emerging sports to provide greater participation opportunities for female student-athletes should "supplement" and not "supplant" the opportunity to participate in existing sports.

Action: Adopted by Division II (191-12).

*NO. 13

RESOLUTION: NCAA MEMBERS STRUCTURES

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, based upon input received by the NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission, there appears to be interest in considering alternative membership structures that might better address the financial conditions that negatively impact higher education and intercollegiate athletics, the expressed desire of some members for greater program-wide homogeneity within voting membership classifications, and the challenges created by the commit-

A-16 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

ment of NCAA institutions to provide gender equity in athletics; and
"Whereas, the Council and Commission believe that modifying the Association's current structure could have far-reaching ramifications affecting all institutions; and

"Whereas, the NCAA Joint Policy Board has appointed a special committee to conduct a review of this topic; and

"Whereas, the special committee has been charged with soliciting membership advice to establish the topics that must be addressed by any model to be considered as part of this review and then soliciting suggested models from various NCAA constituencies;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the special committee shall, after appropriate review and dialogue, present what it deems to be the most acceptable models to the membership for review, reaction and possible action at the 1995 NCAA Convention, with final action, in any event, not later than the 1996 NCAA Convention."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Joint Policy Board, Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Action: Adopted (776-21, six abstentions).

NO. 14 (NO. 2-2) PROVISIONAL MEMBERSHIP CATEGORY

Intent: To establish a three-year provisional membership category for prospective NCAA member institutions. [Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in Constitution 3 and 4, and in Bylaws 18 and 20 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

A. Constitution: Amend 3.01.1, page 7, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"3.01.1 Classes of Membership. The NCAA offers four **five** classes of membership: active, conference, affiliated, and corresponding **and provisional**. Eligibility for and method of election to membership, obligations and conditions for continuing membership, voting rights, and other membership privileges for each class are defined in this article."

B. Constitution: Amend 3.02.3 by adding new 3.02.3.5, page 8, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"3.02.3.5 **Provisional Member.** A provisional member is a four-year college or university or a two-year upper-level collegiate institution accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting agency and that has applied for active membership in the Association. Provisional membership is a prerequisite for active membership in the Association. The institution shall be elected to provisional membership under the provisions of this article (see 3.6.3). Provisional members shall receive all publications and mailings received by active members in addition to other privileges designated in the constitution and bylaws of

Legislative Proposals _____ A-17

the Association. Provisional membership is limited to a three-year period."

C. Constitution: Amend 3.2.3, page 9, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"3.2.3 Election Procedures.

[3.2.3.1 unchanged.]

"3.2.3.2 Application. An institution desiring to become an active member of this Association shall make application on a form available from the national office. A check in the appropriate amount for annual dues (see 3.6.3) shall accompany the application. Should the applicant fail to qualify academically or fail election, the dues paid shall be refunded. **complete a three-year provisional membership period (see 3.6).** After it has been determined that the institution has met the requirements of provisional membership, its request for active membership will be referred to the Council for election.

[3.2.3.3 and 3.2.3.4 unchanged.]

"3.2.3.5 Resignation and Reelection to Membership. If an institution resigns its membership and subsequently applies to reestablish its membership, the application institution first shall be approved by the Council **complete a three-year provisional membership period (see 3.6)** before such institution becomes eligible for reelection as an active member."

D. Constitution: Amend 3.3.1.2, page 12, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"3.3.1.2 Composition of Conference. All of the members of the conference shall be active members of this Association, except that a conference with 40 or more members may qualify as a member conference if 90 percent of its member institutions are active members of the Association. **A conference may retain its membership if it includes institutions that have been provisional members of the Association for at least one year.**"

E. Constitution: Amend Constitution 3 by adding new 3.6, page 16, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"3.6 PROVISIONAL MEMBERSHIP

"3.6.1 Eligibility.

"3.6.1.1 Types of Institutions. Provisional membership is available to four-year colleges and universities and two-year upper-level collegiate institutions, accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting agency and duly elected to provisional membership under the provisions of 3.6.3.

"3.6.1.1.1 Three-Year Provision. Provisional membership shall be limited to a three-year period. At the end of the three-year period, a provisional member shall be eligible to apply for active membership (see 3.2.3).

"3.6.1.2 Compliance with Association Rules. A provisional member shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association.

"3.6.1.2.1 Three-Year Progression. During the first year of provisional membership, an institution shall apply the legislation of the Association to the greatest extent possible. During the second and third years of provisional membership, an institution shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association.

"3.6.1.3 Standards. The institution's athletics programs shall reflect the establishment and maintenance of high standards of personal honor, eligibility and fair play.

"3.6.1.4 Four-Sport/Three-Season Requirement. After one year of provisional membership, the institution shall sponsor and conduct a representative schedule in a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports that involve all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females and four varsity intercollegiate sports that involve all-female teams, subject to the requirements of the institution's conference(s), if any. An institution may utilize a sport to meet the three-season requirement only if the institution has met the minimum contest and participants requirements for sports sponsorship in that sport as set forth in 20.9.3.3 (Division I), 20.10.3.5 (Division II) or 20.11.3.2 (Division III). (See 3.6.4.5 regarding the provisional member's obligations in meeting this requirement.)

"3.6.2 Privileges and Voting Rights.

"3.6.2.1 Provisional Members. Provisional members shall receive all publications and mailings received by active members of the Association, shall be entitled to be represented by one nonvoting delegate at any Convention of the Association and shall have such other privileges as may be accorded by the bylaws of the Association.

"3.6.2.2 Use of Association's Registered Marks. A provisional member may use the registered marks of the Association (i.e., the Association's name, seal, logo or other insignia) only in accordance with guidelines established by the Council.

"3.6.3 Election Procedures.

"3.6.3.1 Voting Requirement. Procedures for election to provisional membership under this subsection are common provisions (see 5.02.1.2) established by majority vote of each of the three divisions voting separately.

"3.6.3.2 Application. An institution desiring to become a provisional member of this Association shall apply on a form available from the national office. A check in the appropriate amount for annual dues (see the current annual dues for active members per 3.7.3) shall accompany the application. Should the applicant fail to qualify academically or fail election, the dues paid shall be refunded.

"3.6.3.3 Accreditation and Division Classification. After it has been determined that the institution meets the Association's requirement of acceptable academic standards (i.e., the institution is accredited by one of the six regional accrediting agencies), the application shall be considered with regard to requested membership division in accordance with Bylaw 20. The application then shall be referred to the Council for consideration.

"3.6.3.4 Election. A favorable vote by two-thirds of the Council members present and voting shall elect the applicant to provisional membership effective the following September 1. When the vote of the Council has been completed, the applicant shall be notified.

"3.6.4 Conditions and Obligations of Membership.

"3.6.4.1 General. During the first year of the three-year provisional membership, an institution shall apply the legislation of the Association to the greatest extent possible. During the second and third years of provisional membership, an institution shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association.

"3.6.4.2 Self-Study and Annual Review. During the first year of provisional membership, a provisional member shall complete a comprehensive institutional self-study and evaluation of the member's intercollegiate athletics program. A provisional member also shall provide, on an annual basis, a written report to be reviewed by the Council describing the institution's progress in meeting active membership requirements. The annual report shall be received in the national office not later than July 15.

"3.6.4.3 Convention and Regional Seminar Attendance. A representative from a provisional institution shall attend the annual Convention of the Association. Provisional members of Divisions I and II also shall attend at least one regional compliance seminar each year conducted by the NCAA or a member conference.

"3.6.4.4 Coaches Certification. During the second and

third years of provisional membership, coaches of provisional members in Divisions I and II shall be certified to recruit off campus per 11.5.

"3.6.4.5 Compliance Period. Following the institution's first year of provisional membership, a provisional member shall fulfill the conditions and obligations applicable to active members per 3.2.4.3 through 3.2.4.12, except that the waivers described in 3.2.4.11.5 and 3.2.4.11.6 shall not apply.

"3.6.5 Loss of Provisional Membership.

"3.6.5.1 Termination. The membership of any provisional member failing to maintain the academic or athletics standards required for such membership or failing to meet the conditions and obligations of membership may be terminated by a two-thirds vote of the Council members present and voting. A notice of intention to terminate membership, stating the grounds on which such a motion will be based, shall be given in writing to the chief executive officer of the member institution.

"3.6.5.2 Cessation of Rights and Privileges. All rights and privileges of the provisional member shall cease upon any termination of provisional membership.

"3.6.5.3 Noncompliance. If a provisional member, during its compliance period, no longer meets the requirements of the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of this Association, it shall be reclassified immediately as a corresponding member.

"3.6.5.4 Discipline of Member Conference. During the provisional member's compliance period, disciplinary or corrective actions other than termination of membership may be effected on a member conference that contains provisional members that fail to fulfill conditions and obligations of provisional membership.

"3.6.5.5 Reinstatement of Terminated Member. Any provisional member whose membership is terminated may reapply for membership after a period of one year by a two-thirds vote of the Council members present and voting."

F. Bylaws: Amend 20.02 by adding new 20.02.4, page 323, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"20.02.4 Provisional Membership. Provisional membership is a prerequisite for active membership. It is limited to a three-year period. During the second and third years of provisional membership, an institution shall administer its athletics programs in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association."

G. Bylaws: Amend 20.1.1, page 323, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"20.1.1 Designation of Division by Active and Provisional Members. Each active and provisional member institution shall be designated as a member of Division I, Division II or Division III for certain legislative and competitive purposes."

[Remainder of 20.1.1 unchanged.]

H. Bylaws: Amend 20.2, page 324, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"20.2 Eligibility of New Member.

"20.2.1 Application Requirements for Active Members. An institution applying for membership in the Association may designate any division for which it meets the applicable criteria (See 20.9 for Division I criteria, 20.10 for Division II criteria, 20.11 for Division III criteria and 20.4 for multidivision-classification criteria.)

"20.2.1.1 **20.2.1** Determination of Division/Submission for Election. At the time of application, a prospective member shall designate the membership division it desires and any desired multidivision classification per 20.4. The membership application shall be reviewed with regard to the prospective member's conformance with applicable division criteria. The application then shall be submitted for possible election to **provisional** membership (effective the following September 1) in accordance with the provisions of Constitution 3.

"20.2.2 Conformity with Division Criteria for Two Years. In designating its desired membership division, the applicant institution shall certify that:

"(a) It has operated in conformity with the membership criteria of this article for the desired division for a period of two years, or

"(b) It began or will begin to operate in conformity with the membership criteria of this article for the desired division upon the commencement of its intercollegiate athletics program (if the institution has not operated an intercollegiate athletics program for two years prior to application).

"**20.2.2 Three-Year Provision.** Provisional membership shall be limited to a three-year period. During the first year of provisional membership, an institution shall apply the legislation of the Association to the greatest extent possible. During the second and third years of provisional membership, an institution shall operate in conformity with the membership criteria of this article.

"20.2.2.1 Criteria in Effect for Less Than Two Years. If particular membership criteria have been in effect for less than two years, the applicant institution **provisional member** is obligated to show conformity with those criteria only from the effective date of their adoption.

"20.2.3 Waiver of Criteria. If an institution does not meet the criteria of the desired division, it may request a waiver of the criteria according to the procedures specified in 20.3.5.2.

"20.2.4 **20.2.3** Eligibility of New Member for Championships. To be el-

igible for NCAA championships immediately following the September 1 on which an institution's election to membership becomes effective, the institution shall:

"(a) Have operated in conformity with the membership criteria of this article for its division for a period of two years for Divisions I and II only, **been an active member of this Association for a period of two consecutive years;**"

[20.2.4-(b), 20.2.4-(c) and 20.2.4.1, renumbered as 20.2.3-(b), 20.2.3-(c) and 20.2.3.1, unchanged.]

I. Bylaws: Amend 20.3.5.2, page 326, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"20.3.5.2 Waivers of Division Membership Criteria. If an institution applying for membership, multidivision classification or change of division membership, or an institution placed in the 'restricted membership' category (per 20.3.5.1), does not meet the criteria of its preferred division, or if an **active member** institution does not meet (or does not expect to meet within the applicable compliance period, if any) new criteria adopted by the membership of its division, it may request a waiver of the criteria from the membership of the preferred division according to the procedures specified below.

[20.3.5.2.1 through 20.3.5.2.4 unchanged.]

"20.3.5.2.4.1 Maximum Three-Year Waiver Period. If after three years from the effective date of election **multidivision classification or reclassification** (September 1 following the Convention) the institution receiving such a waiver has not conformed to all adopted criteria of the division, the institution's membership (or its sport per 20.4):"

[Remainder of 20.3.5.2 unchanged.]

J. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.4.1 by adding new 20.9.4.1.4, page 335, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"**20.9.4.1.4 Provisional Member Opponents.** A Division I provisional institution that has been a member of the Association for a minimum of one year may be counted by its Division I active member opponents in meeting their Division I scheduling requirements."

K. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.5.1.1, page 335, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"20.9.5.1.1 Two-Game Limit for Applicants **Provisional Members.** An institution applying for membership **A provisional member** in Division I may **shall** schedule and play not more than two men's basketball games in an academic year against institutions that are not members of Division I. **A provisional member is not required to apply scheduling criteria during its first year of membership.**"

[Remainder of 20.9.5.1.1 unchanged.]

- L. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.5.2, page 335, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"20.9.5.2 One-Third of Men's Contests in Home Arena. **A** **an** active member of Division I or **an** institution applying for membership **a** **provisional member** in Division I must play at least one-third of its regular-season men's basketball contests in the arena regularly used for the institution's home games. **A provisional member is not required to apply scheduling criteria during its first year of membership.**"

[Remainder of 20.9.5.2 unchanged.]

- M. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.5.3.1, page 336, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"20.9.5.3.1 Two-Game Limit for Applicants **Provisional Members**. *An institution applying for membership* **A provisional member** in Division I *may* **shall** schedule and play not more than two women's basketball games in an academic year against institutions that are not members of Division I. **A provisional member is not required to apply scheduling criteria during its first year of membership.**"

[Remainder of 20.9.5.3.1 unchanged.]

- N. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.5.4.1 by adding new 20.9.5.4.1.2, page 336, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"20.9.5.4.1.2 **Provisional Member Opponents**. **A Division I provisional institution that has been a member of the Association for a minimum of one year may be counted by its Division I active member opponents in meeting their Division I scheduling requirements.**"

- O. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.6.2.1 by adding new 20.9.6.2.1.2, page 336, as follows:

[Division I-A football only, roll call]

"20.9.6.2.1.2 **Provisional Member Opponents**. **A Division I-A provisional institution that has been a member of the Association for a minimum of one year may be counted by its Division I-A active member opponents in meeting their Division I-A scheduling requirements.**"

- P. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.7.2.1 by adding new 20.9.7.2.1.2, page 338, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only, roll call]

"20.9.7.2.1.2 **Provisional Member Opponents**. **A Division I-AA provisional institution that has been a member of the Association for a minimum of one year may be counted by its Division I-AA active member opponents in meeting their Division I-AA scheduling requirements.**"

- Q. Bylaws: Add 20.10.4.3.1.2, page 342, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"20.10.4.3.1.2 **Provisional Member Opponents**. **A Division II provisional institution that has been a member of the Association for a minimum of one year may be counted by its Division II provisional or active member opponents in meeting their Division II scheduling requirements.**"

- R. Bylaws: Add 20.11.5.3.1.2, page 345, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"20.11.5.3.1.2 **Provisional Member Opponents**. **A Division III provisional institution that has been a member of the Association for a minimum of one year may be counted by its Division III provisional or active member opponents in meeting their Division III scheduling requirements.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Effective Date: September 2, 1994.

Rationale: This proposal will establish a uniform three-year application process for prospective member institutions. The first year will permit the member to complete an "orientation" or "educational" year in which the institution will receive all NCAA official forms, publications, mailings and general information from the national office regarding the requirements and activities of the Association. During the first year, the institution will not be required to apply NCAA rules or regulations. During the second and third years of provisional membership, members will be expected to be in full compliance with the Association's legislation. The institution will be required to administer its athletics program under the rules and regulations of its preferred division, including administration of appropriate official forms of the Association. The member may be counted as an NCAA opponent in the division in which it seeks active membership for the purposes of meeting scheduling requirements. No waiver opportunities will be available to a provisional member other than those related to circumstances beyond an institution's control (e.g., weather problems). Election to active membership will be handled by the appropriate steering committee and will be determined strictly on the basis of compliance with the provisional membership requirements.

Action: Parts A through E adopted (773-22, four abstentions). Parts F, G and I adopted by Division I (290-7, eight abstentions), Division II (193-15, two abstentions) and Division III (248-7, five abstentions). Part H defeated by Division I (235-56, 13 abstentions), Division II (65-145) and Division III (139-117, 10 abstentions). Parts J through N adopted (301-1, two abstentions). Part O adopted (100-1, two abstentions). Part P adopted (117-0). Part Q adopted (198-2). Part R adopted (256-7).

NO. 15 (NO. 2-141) **CHANGE OF DIVISION MEMBERSHIP
— NOTIFICATION AND CHAMPION-
SHIPS ELIGIBILITY**

Intent: To establish a two-year notification requirement for institutions that intend to reclassify from Division II to Division I; to exclude those institutions that have forwarded such notice to the national office from eligibility for any Division II NCAA championship, and to exempt from this legislation institutions that petition not later than June 1, 1994, to reclassify from Division II to Division I, effective not later than September 1, 1995, provided the exempted institutions are not eligible for Division II championships during the transition period.

- A. **Bylaws:** Amend 20.5.2 by adding new 20.5.2.1, page 328, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"20.5.2.1 Reclassification from Division II to Division I — Notification Requirement. The chief executive officer of a Division II member that intends to petition for reclassification to Division I per 20.5.2.2 shall submit to the Association's executive director written notice of the institution's intention to reclassify. The notice shall be received in the national office (by mail or wired transmission) not later than June 1 two years prior to the September 1 when the institution intends to reclassify to Division I.

"20.5.2.1.1 Exception. A Division II institution that petitions not later than June 1, 1994, to reclassify to Division I effective not later than September 1, 1995, shall not be subject to this notification requirement, provided it meets all applicable Division I membership criteria per 20.5.2.2 and 20.5.2.3."

[20.5.2.1 through 20.5.2.3, renumbered as 20.5.2.2 through 20.5.2.4, unchanged.]

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 20.5.3 by adding new 20.5.3.1, page 328, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"20.5.3.1 Reclassification from Division II to Division I. A member of Division II that has forwarded to the national office written notice of its intention to change its membership classification to Division I per 20.5.2.1 or that has petitioned to reclassify to Division I per 20.5.2.1.1 no longer shall be eligible to participate in any subsequent Division II NCAA championship."

- C. **Bylaws:** Amend 31.3.3, by adding new 31.3.3.6, page 404, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"31.3.3.6 Exclusion of Institution Reclassifying from Division II to Division I. In all sports, any Division II institu-

tion that has forwarded to the national office written notice of its intention to change its membership classification to Division I per 20.5.2.1 or that has petitioned to reclassify to Division I per 20.5.2.1.1 no longer shall be eligible to participate in any subsequent Division II NCAA championship."

Source: All members of the Gulf South Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: It is unfair for Division II institutions that are reclassifying to Division I to remain eligible for Division II championships. Those institutions already are recruiting with the promise of being a Division I member within two years, they are spending a great deal more money than most Division II members, they "eat" shares of the basketball revenue that should be going to the Division II members and conferences, they can, because of their impending Division I status, schedule opponents that many Division II institutions cannot play and they expand their staffs and operate at a higher level to prepare to compete in Division I.

Committee Position (Division II Steering Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal but noted initially that the proposal did not require a date by which a Division II institution would have to declare its intent to move to Division I, and expressed concern about what the effect would be of an immediate effective date on those Division II institutions that already have notified the NCAA national office of their intent to move to Division I effective September 1, 1994. [Note: The sponsors subsequently amended the legislation to address these concerns.]

Action: Adopted by Division II (159-25, two abstentions).

NO. 16 (NO. 2-155) **RESOLUTION: NEED-BASED
FINANCIAL AID**

[Divisions I and II, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, it is the sense of the membership that some means must be found to reduce the costs of intercollegiate athletics and that this must be accomplished without denying students access to higher education or significantly altering the competitive balance among NCAA member institutions; and

"Whereas, based on the input received by the NCAA Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics, there is interest in considering a financial aid model for athletics wherein student-athletes may receive athletics grants for tuition and fees, and financial assistance awarded solely on the basis of need for room and board, books, supplies and indirect costs, which may not exceed the cost of attendance;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism be charged with the preparation of legislative proposals for consideration by the membership at the 1995 NCAA Convention."

Source: NCAA Council; Bradley University; Eastern Illinois University; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; Illinois State University; Indiana State University; University of Northern Iowa; Southwest Missouri State University; University of Tulsa; Western Illinois University, and Wichita State University.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee voted to support this resolution but asked the sponsors of this proposal to amend the time table for the committee to prepare legislation to be developed not later than the 1996 Convention rather than a mandatory date of the 1995 Convention. [Note: In this regard, the NCAA Council subsequently voted to sponsor Proposal No. 16-1.]

Action: Mooted by adoption of 16-1.

NO. 16-1

**RESOLUTION: NEED-BASED
FINANCIAL AID**

[Divisions I and II, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, it is the sense of the membership that some means must be found to reduce the costs of intercollegiate athletics and that this must be accomplished without denying students access to higher education or significantly altering the competitive balance among NCAA member institutions; and

"Whereas, based on the input received by the NCAA Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics, there is interest in considering a financial aid model for athletics wherein student-athletes may receive athletics grants for tuition and fees, and financial assistance awarded solely on the basis of need for room and board, books, supplies and indirect costs, which may not exceed the cost of attendance;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism be charged with the preparation of legislative proposals for consideration by the membership at the 1995 NCAA Convention.

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism be charged with making a report on this issue to the 1995 Convention and to submit appropriate legislation for consideration by the membership not later than the 1996 Convention."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism) and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Action: Adopted (439-61, two abstentions).

**NO. 17 (NO. 2-54) ELIGIBILITY — SEASONS OF
COMPETITION**

Intent: To permit student-athletes in Divisions I and II to engage in five seasons of intercollegiate competition within the five-year/10-semester eligibility period; to delete legislation related to the hardship waiver and season-of-competition waiver; to per-

mit partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers to participate in not more than four seasons of competition in Division I and five seasons of competition in Division II, and to specify that partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers who have exhausted four seasons of competition in Division I shall not be eligible for further seasons of competition in Division II.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.2, page 124, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A football, Division I-AA football, Division I-A, all other Division I members and Division II, divided vote, roll call]

**"14 2 SEASONS OF COMPETITION: FIVE-YEAR/10-SEMESTER
RULE**

"The student-athlete shall not engage in more than four five seasons of intercollegiate competition in any one sport (see 14.02.6 and 14.3.3). An institution shall not permit a student-athlete to represent it in intercollegiate competition unless the individual completes all of his or her seasons of participation in all sports within the time periods specified below:"

[Remainder of 14.2 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.2.5, pages 127-128, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A football, Division I-AA football, Division I-A, all other Division I members and Division II, divided vote, roll call]

"14 2 5 Hardship Waiver A student-athlete may be granted an additional year of competition by the conference or the Eligibility Committee for reasons of 'hardship.' Hardship is defined as an incapacity resulting from an injury or illness that has occurred under all of the following conditions."

[Remainder of 14.2.5 deleted.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 14.2.6, pages 128-129, by deleting the current dominant voting requirement (*) and substituting a federated voting requirement (I/II/III).

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

D. Bylaws: Amend 14.2.6, pages 128-129, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A football, Division I-AA football, Division I-A, all other Division I members and Division II, divided vote, roll call]

"14 2.6 Season-of-Competition Waiver In conjunction with a request for restoration of eligibility and any conditions imposed thereon per Bylaw 14.14, a student-athlete may be granted an additional season of competition by the Eligibility Committee when he or she participated in a limited amount of competition as a result of a good-faith, erroneous formal declaration of eligibility by the institution's appropriate certifying authority The competition must have occurred under all of the following conditions:"

[Remainder of 14.2.6 deleted.]

E. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.3, page 137, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A football, Division I-AA football, Division I-A, all other Division I members and Division II, divided vote, roll call]

"14.3.3 Seasons of Competition — Partial Qualifier and Non-qualifier. Partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers, recruited or non-recruited, shall not engage in more than the following number of seasons of competition:

"(a) Division I: *Three* **Four** seasons of competition. A student who transfers to a Division I member institution from another collegiate institution shall not engage in more than *four* **five** seasons of competition with not more than *three* **four** of those seasons in Division I.

"(b) Division II: *Four* **Five** seasons of competition, except that such student-athletes who have exhausted *three* **four** seasons of competition in Division I shall not be eligible for further seasons of competition in Division II."

Source: Auburn University; University of Cincinnati; Colorado State University; University of Louisville; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Rice University; University of Tennessee; Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin; Texas Christian University; West Virginia University and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1994.

Rationale: With the increased emphasis on graduation rates and the general welfare of student-athletes, a fifth year of eligibility will provide the opportunity for an increasing number of student-athletes to obtain a baccalaureate degree. The 1992-93 NCAA Division I graduation-rates report reveals that student-athletes take an average of 4.7 years to graduate. This proposal will eliminate the current practice of "redshirting" and obtaining medical-hardship and season-of-competition waivers, and reduce recruiting expenses due to a reduction in the number of initial grants offered each year. For those student-athletes who obtain a degree in less than five years, this proposal would provide an opportunity to participate in graduate-level courses that will enhance their post-collegiate employment.

Committee Position (Eligibility Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Parts A, B and E withdrawn in Divisions I, I-A and I-AA. Parts A, B and D defeated by Division II (34-168, three abstentions). Parts C and D withdrawn.

NO. 18

RESOLUTION: FIVE SEASONS OF COMPETITION

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, the NCAA membership has enacted legislation that effectively has linked athletics eligibility with sustained, measurable progress toward a baccalaureate degree; and,

"Whereas, a key component affecting the welfare of student-athletes is their ability to obtain a quality college education and an academic degree; and,

A-30 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

"Whereas, recent revisions in continuing-eligibility legislation placed student-athletes on a five-year program to complete their degree; and,

"Whereas, the current atmosphere surrounding intercollegiate athletics has emphasized the reduction of financial expenditures; and,

"Whereas, providing financial support to student-athletes who are completing their baccalaureate degree requires institutions to support degree-completion programs resulting in significant expense; and,

"Whereas, permitting student-athletes to participate in five seasons of athletics competition will provide increased opportunities for student-athletes to receive financial support to complete their baccalaureate degree requirements; and,

"Whereas, the concept of five years of eligibility also generally is believed to have great potential for reducing the expense involved in recruiting large numbers of prospective student-athletes;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council be charged with conducting a study of all issues affected by a revision of NCAA Bylaw 14.2 to permit student-athletes to participate in five seasons of intercollegiate competition, and prepare appropriate legislative proposals for consideration by the membership at the 1995 NCAA Convention regarding this topic."

Source: Auburn University, University of Georgia; Louisiana State University, McNeese State University, Nicholls State University; Northeast Louisiana State University; Northwestern State University (Louisiana) and Sam Houston State University.

Action: Defeated (158-649, two abstentions).

*NO. 19 (NO. 2-5) REVISED LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

Intent: To revise the Association's legislative calendar by establishing new submission and publication dates for legislative proposals.

A. Constitution: Amend 5.3, pages 32-36, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"5.3 AMENDMENT PROCESS

"5.3.1 Authorizing Legislation

[5.3.1.1 unchanged.]

"5.3.1.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. A proposed amendment to a provision of the constitution or bylaws may be amended at any annual or special Convention or at a division legislative meeting. From July 1 through September 1 **July 15 through September 15**, sponsors of proposed legislation may refine and change proposals in any manner that is germane to the original proposal. After September 1 **September 15** proposed amendments may be amended only if the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase

Legislative Proposals _____ A-31

the modification of the provision to be amended.
[5.3.2 unchanged.]

5.3.3 Submission Deadline

5.3.3.1 Amendment. Deadline dates for receipt at the national office of proposed amendments are as follows:

5.3.3.1.1 Amendment Proposed by Membership

(a) Annual Convention — 5 p.m. Central time *July 1 July 15* [conference-sponsored amendments must meet the *July 15* deadline, and the required chief executive officer signatures for these proposals, per 5.3.2.1-(e), must be received by 5 p.m. Central time *August 1*].

[5.3.3.1.1-(b) and 5.3.3.1.1-(c) unchanged.]

5.3.3.1.1.1 Exception The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after *July 1 July 15*.

5.3.3.1.2 Amendments Sponsored by NCAA Council, Steering Committee or Presidents Commission.

(a) Annual Convention—*August 15 September 1*.

[5.3.3.1.2-(b) unchanged.]

5.3.3.1.2.1 Exception. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after *August 15 September 1*.

5.3.3.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. Sponsors of proposed amendments must submit amendments to their original proposals in writing and such amendments must be received at the Association's national office not later than 5 p.m. Central time *September 1 September 15*, unless the amendment-to-amendment does not increase the modification specified in the original proposal per 5.3.1.2. Any amendment to a proposed amendment submitted after *September 1 September 15* shall not increase the modification of the original proposal and must be submitted in writing and received at the Association's national office not later than 5 p.m. Central time *October 15 November 1* preceding an annual Convention or 60 days preceding a special Convention.

[Remainder of 5.3.3 and 5.3.4 unchanged.]

5.3.5 Notification to Membership

5.3.5.1 Initial Publication. Proposed amendments shall be published for the information of the membership as follows:

(a) Not later than *August 1 August 15* — Those proposed by the membership, including the primary contact person's name, title and member institution or member confer-

ence, as well as the sponsor's statements of intent and rationale and any proposals designated for inclusion by the Council, its steering committees or the Presidents Commission; and

(b) Not later than *September 15 September 23* — Those submitted by the Council, a steering committee or the Presidents Commission and those modified by sponsors per 5.3.3.2, or

[Remainder of 5.3.5.1 and 5.3.5.2 unchanged.]

5.3.5.3 Delayed Date. If the Council establishes a date later than *July 1 July 15* or *August 15 September 1* for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention, it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for publishing copies of the proposed amendments for information of the membership

5.3.5.4 Amendment-to-Amendment. Copies of all amendments to proposed amendments submitted by the proposal's original sponsors pursuant to the *September 1 September 15* deadline shall be published by *September 15 September 23*. Copies of all other amendments to proposed amendments submitted by the *October 15 November 1* deadline shall be published in the Official Notice of the Convention."

[Remainder of 5.3 unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend 5.4.2.4, page 38, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

5.4.2.4 Submission Deadline. A proposed resolution must be submitted in writing to the national office prior to *October 15 November 1*."

[Remainder of 5.4.2.4 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council, NCAA Presidents Commission and all members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic, Missouri Valley, Pacific-10 and Patriot League Conferences; University of Connecticut, Frostburg State University, University of Pittsburgh, Syracuse University and Wilkes University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current legislative calendar requires legislative proposals to be submitted during the summer immediately after the Collegiate Commissioners Association meetings and some conference meetings, and the review period for such proposals occurs later during the summer when many institutional representatives are absent from campus. The proposed legislative calendar would permit the review process for membership-sponsored amendments to occur during the August 15-September 15 time period, when institutional representatives have returned to campus.

Committee Position (Legislative Review Committee): The committee voted to support this proposal, inasmuch as the Council is a co-sponsor of this legislation.

Action: Adopted (464-335, four abstentions).

***NO. 20 (NO. 2-153) RESOLUTION: BIENNIAL CONVENTION**

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, the Special NCAA Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics has recommended that legislation be sponsored to schedule regular NCAA Conventions only in alternate years; and

"Whereas, it appears that conducting the NCAA Convention on a biennial basis could result in a significant savings for the Association and its member institutions, and

"Whereas, further study is necessary to ascertain the amount of money that may be saved by adopting such legislation; and

"Whereas, respondents to a survey conducted by the special committee generally reacted favorably to the concept of a biennial Convention as a further way to contain costs; and

"Whereas, members of the Association also have expressed interest in the concept of alternate-year Conventions, or at least alternate-year legislative sessions, to stabilize the Association's legislative process and facilitate the membership's absorption and implementation of new legislation; and

"Whereas, the interest of the membership in this concept should be determined more clearly;

"Now, Therefore, *Be It Resolved*, that the NCAA Council and Presidents Commission study in more detail the concepts of establishing a biennial Convention or biennial legislative Convention, including the potential savings to the Association and the NCAA membership that a biennial Convention would create, as well as the interest of the Association's member institutions and conferences in this concept; and

"*Be It Further Resolved*, that, based upon the results of this study, the Council and Presidents Commission prepare legislation, if appropriate, for consideration by the membership at the 1995 NCAA Convention."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Special NCAA Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Action: Adopted (464-335, four abstentions).

***NO. 21 (NO. 2-135) INDEPENDENT HEARING OFFICER**

Intent: To specify that in major infractions, the Committee on Infractions may refer a case or part of a case to an independent hearing officer who will review disputed facts concerning one or more alleged violation(s) and present findings of fact to the Committee on Infractions. [Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in Bylaws 19 and 32 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

A. Bylaws: Amend 19.1.3, pages 316-317, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"19.1.3 Duties of Committee. The duties of the Committee on Infractions shall be as follows:

[19.1.3-(a) through 19.1.3-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) **Refer consideration of a case or any portion of a case involving disputed facts to a hearing officer.**"

[19.1.3-(d), 19.1.3-(e), relettered as 19.1.3-(e) and 19.1.3-(f), unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 19 by adding new 19.2, page 317, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"19.2 INDEPENDENT HEARING OFFICERS

"19.2.1 Appointment and Duties. The Administrative Committee shall appoint hearing officers who, pursuant to the hearing process in major infractions cases (see 32.7), shall be responsible for reviewing disputed facts concerning one or more alleged violations and present findings of fact to the Committee on Infractions and the parties who participate in the hearing before the hearing officer.

"19.2.2 Decision to Utilize Hearing Officer. The Committee on Infractions has the sole discretion to determine whether to utilize a hearing officer in the infractions process. The committee may exercise this discretion only when one or more of the following factors are present:

"(a) The committee determines that discussion before the committee would be protracted and counterproductive to the committee's efficient consideration of the case;

"(b) The committee determines that use of a hearing officer would be an aid in resolving facts that were in dispute prior to the committee's consideration of the case, or

"(c) The institution or an individual identified in 32.5.5 or 32.5.6 requests the use of a hearing officer to consider the facts in dispute, and the committee determines that the use of a hearing officer would be in the best interests of fact finding."

C. Bylaws: Amend 32.1, page 421, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"32.1 COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS AND HEARING OFFICER -- SPECIAL OPERATING RULES

"32.1.1 Confidentiality. The Committee on Infractions, hearing officers, the enforcement staff and the Council shall treat all cases before them as confidential until the same have been announced in accordance with the prescribed procedures.

[32.1.2 unchanged.]

"32.1.3 Conflict of Interest. Any member of the Committee on Infractions or Council **or a hearing officer** who is directly connected with an institution under inquiry shall not take part in any NCAA proceedings connected with the case *before the committee or the Council*. In addition, Committee on Infractions **members, or** Council members, **or hearing officers** with personal relationships or institutional affiliations that reasonably would result in the appearance of prejudice should refrain from participating in any manner in the processing of the involved institution's or individual's infractions case. It is the responsibility of the committee **member, or** Council member, **or hearing officer** to remove himself or herself if a conflict exists. Objections to the participation of a committee or Council member or a hearing officer should be raised as soon as recognized, but will not be considered unless raised at least one week in advance of the affected hearing."

- D. **Bylaws:** Amend 32 by adding new 32.8, page 430, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"32.8 HEARINGS BEFORE AN INDEPENDENT HEARING OFFICER

"32.8.1 Committee Referral. When the Committee on Infractions determines that an independent hearing officer should be utilized (per 19.2.2), the committee will refer to the hearing officer all appropriate factual allegations for consideration.

"32.8.2 Hearing Procedures. When assigned allegations for consideration, a hearing officer shall promptly schedule a hearing that shall be conducted in accordance with enforcement procedures applicable to Committee on Infractions hearings (see 32.7).

"32.8.3 Notification of Findings. Subsequent to the hearing, the hearing officer shall report findings of fact in writing to the Committee on Infractions and the parties who participated in the hearing within 30 days after the conclusion of the hearing or, if later, within 30 days after the filing of any posthearing written materials requested by the hearing officer.

"32.8.4 Findings Set Aside. A finding arrived at by a hearing officer shall not be set aside by the Committee on Infractions except upon a determination that:

- "(a) The hearing officer's finding clearly is contrary to the evidence presented to the hearing officer;
- "(b) The facts found by the hearing officer do not constitute a violation of the Association's rules, or
- "(c) A procedural error affected the reliability of the infraction that was utilized to support the hearing officer's finding."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Ad Hoc Committee to Study Enforcement Issues).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The ad hoc committee believes there is a widely held perception that the functions of the enforcement staff and the ultimate decision maker, the Committee on Infractions, are not separated adequately. The use of an independent jurist to resolve disputed facts would enhance the public's perception of fairness and confidence in the enforcement process. It is not intended that the use of an independent hearing officer will make the process more adversarial; indeed, the special committee believes that hearings will be conducted as in the past, except that an experienced legal expert, such as a former judge, who is not connected with the NCAA in any way may be used to review and resolve disputed facts. Such individuals are trained in weighing conflicting evidence, judging credibility and determining whether the burden of proof has been satisfied. A pool of such individuals, trained to make certain that they have sufficient background in NCAA regulations, will be necessary to assure the availability of a sufficient number of hearing officers. The NCAA Administrative Committee, consisting of the five elected NCAA officers and the executive director, will be responsible for selecting and maintaining the pool of hearing officers.

Action: Parts A, C and D adopted (762-40, four abstentions). Part B adopted by Division I (291-19), Division II (200-6) and Division III (252-14).

**NO. 22 (NO. 2-61) SATISFACTORY PROGRESS —
REGULAR ACADEMIC YEAR**

Intent: To reduce from 75 percent to 62.5 percent the amount of satisfactory-progress credit hours that a Division I student-athlete must earn during the regular academic year, and to increase from 25 percent to 37.5 percent the amount of satisfactory-progress credit hours that a student may earn during the summer.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.4.1, page 140, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.5.4.1 Regular Academic Year. The student-athlete shall earn at least ~~75~~ **62.5** percent of the semester or quarter hours required for satisfactory progress during the regular academic year. The student-athlete shall earn no more than ~~25~~ **37.5** percent of the semester or quarter hours required for satisfactory progress during the summer."

[Remainder of 14.5.4.1 unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; East Carolina University; University of Georgia; University of Oklahoma; University of Pittsburgh; University of Texas at Austin; University of Texas at El Paso; Texas A&M University, and West Virginia University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994 (for credit hours earned during the 1993-1994 academic year and thereafter).

Rationale: This proposal will ensure that Division I student-athletes, particularly freshmen and sophomores, will have the opportunity to continue academic progress and maintain eligibility.

Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee):
The committee strongly opposed this proposal. The committee believes that increasing the percentage of summer-school hours that may be used to establish a student-athlete's continuing eligibility is contrary to the spirit of academic reform. In addition, the committee emphasized the recent implementation of NCAA Bylaw 14.5.4.1 ("75/25") and the lack of compelling, objective evidence regarding the effect of that legislation. Finally, the committee noted that the proposal's effective date will create an additional satisfactory-progress review standard that will further complicate, rather than simplify, the implementation of the Association's new satisfactory-progress requirements.

Action: Defeated (24-298).

*NO. 23 (NO. 2-93) EXPENSES — TRAVEL-SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

Note: The NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission have submitted the following proposal for decision by the Divisions I and II membership. While the Council and the Commission have not taken a position on the proposal, they believe the membership should have an opportunity to consider and vote on the proposal.

Intent: To establish travel-squad limitations for regular-season varsity competition in Divisions I and II when an overnight stay or air travel is involved.

Bylaws: Amend 16.8.1.2 by adding new 16.8.1.2.2, page 202, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"16.8.1.2.2 Travel-Squad Limitations. The following limit on the number of participants (players) who may travel to regular-season varsity competition held away from the institution's home facility, either at the institution's or the student-athlete's expense, shall apply when an overnight stay or air travel is involved:

Baseball	22	Football	60
Basketball, Men	12	Golf, Men	7
Basketball, Women	12	Golf, Women	7
Cross Country, Men	10	Gymnastics, Men	13
Cross Country, Women	10	Gymnastics, Women	1
Fencing, Men	12	Ice Hockey	20
Fencing, Women	12	Lacrosse, Men	32
Field Hockey	16	Lacrosse, Women	32

Rifle	12	Tennis, Women	8
Skiing, Men	12	Track, Indoor, Men	25
Skiing, Women	12	Track, Indoor, Women	22
Soccer, Men	18	Track, Outdoor, Men	30
Soccer, Women	18	Track, Outdoor, Women	26
Softball	20	Volleyball, Men	12
Swimming, Men	20	Volleyball, Women	12
Swimming, Women	20	Water Polo	15
Tennis, Men	8	Wrestling	13

"16.8.1.2.2.1 Traditional-Rival Exception. In each sport, there shall be no travel-squad limit for contests played on one trip each season against one traditional rival."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: While many conferences impose restrictions on travel-squad size, their restrictions often do not apply to nonconference competition. Having a national standard will reduce travel costs significantly.

Action: Defeated as amended by 23-1, 23-2, 23-3 and 23-5 in Division I (133-194, three abstentions). Defeated by Division II (99-104, one abstention).

NO. 23-1 EXPENSES — TRAVEL-SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

Intent: To revise proposed travel-squad size limitations as specified.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 23, 16.8.1.2.2, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"16.8.1.2.2 Travel-Squad Limitations. The following limit on the number of participants (players) who may travel to regular-season varsity competition held away from the institution's home facility, either at the institution's or the student-athlete's expense, shall apply when an overnight stay or air travel is involved:

Cross Country, Men	10 12	Swimming, Men	20 26
Cross Country, Women	10 12	Swimming, Women	20 26
Field Hockey	16 20	Tennis, Men	8 10
Football	60 62	Tennis, Women	8 10
Golf, Men	7 8	Track, Indoor, Men	25 33
Golf, Women	7 8	Track, Indoor, Women	22 33
Ice Hockey	20 21	Track, Outdoor, Men	30 36
Soccer, Men	18 20	Track, Outdoor, Women	26 36"
Soccer, Women	18 20		

[Remainder of 16.8.1.2.2 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Rationale: The sponsors agree with the cost-cutting intent of the original proposal, but believe these numbers better accommodate current differing conference limits, encourage wider participation by nonrecruited student-athletes, and provide a more equitable number of competitors for visiting teams.

Action: Adopted by Division I (169-150, five abstentions). Defeated by Division II (61-149, one abstention).

NO. 23-2 EXPENSES — TRAVEL-SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

Intent: To increase the travel-squad limitations in men's and women's basketball from 12 to 13.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 23, 16.8.1.2.2, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"16.8.1.2.2 Travel-Squad Limitations. The following limit on the number of participants (players) who may travel to regular-season varsity competition held away from the institution's home facility, either at the institution's or the student-athlete's expense, shall apply when an overnight stay or air travel is involved:

"Basketball, Men 12 13

Basketball, Women 12 13"

[Remainder of 16.8.1.2.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Rationale: The Council believes that in the sport of basketball, a travel-squad limit of 13 is more appropriate than a limit of 12.

Action: Adopted by Division I (268-60, one abstention). Defeated by Division II (50-154, two abstentions).

NO. 23-3 EXPENSES — TRAVEL-SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

Intent: To permit an unlimited number of players to travel on one spring-break trip conducted during the traditional segment when classes are not in session.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 23, 16.8.1.2.2, by adding new 16.8.1.2.2.2, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"16.8.1.2.2.2 Spring-Break Trip. Travel-squad size limits shall not apply to one spring-break trip conducted during the traditional segment when classes are not in session."

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Rationale: Spring-break trips often are the first opportunity for teams to play outdoors, especially for northern institutions. A

A-40 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

primary objective is to evaluate freshman players and to prepare full squads for the remainder of the season. Full squads should be allowed to have this expense when the added expense is minimal.

Action: Adopted by Division I (208-118, one abstention). Not moved in Division II.

NO. 23-4 EXPENSES — TRAVEL-SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

Intent: To exempt conference-sponsored, postseason championships from the application of travel-squad size limits.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 23, 16.8.1.2.2, by adding new 16.8.1.2.2.2, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"16.8.1.2.2.2 Conference Championships. Travel-squad size limits shall not apply to contests that are played as part of a conference-sponsored, postseason championship."

Source: Adelphi University, American International College, Boston University, Central Connecticut State University, College of the Holy Cross, Marist College, Merrimack College, Pace University, University of Pennsylvania, St. John's University, Springfield College, Temple University and West Chester University.

Rationale: Since conference championships normally are scheduled over a period of several days, it is essential to permit additional players to travel in the event of injury. Such conference championships often have established travel-squad limits identical to those for NCAA championships and that exceed the proposed limits.

Action: Moot in Divisions I and II.

NO. 23-5 EXPENSES — TRAVEL-SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

Intent: To permit two additional student-athletes to travel when an away trip involves more than one contest date in the sports of baseball, field hockey, ice hockey, soccer and softball.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 23, 16.8.1.2.2, by adding new 16.8.1.2.2.2, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"16.8.1.2.2.2 Consecutive Away Contests. In the sports of baseball, field hockey, ice hockey, soccer and softball, the permissible travel-squad limit shall be increased by two when two or more contests are scheduled to be played away from home on more than one date within three days, provided the team does not return to campus between the contests."

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-41

Rationale: For institutions that minimize missed class time by scheduling consecutive away contests over a two- or three-day trip, it is critical to permit additional players to travel in case of injuries.

Action: Adopted in Division I (193-126, 10 abstentions). Not moved in Division II.

***NO. 24 (NO. 2-20) SCOUTING OF OPPONENTS —
FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL**

Intent: To eliminate off-campus, in-person scouting of opponents in Divisions I-A and I-AA football, and Division I basketball.

A. Bylaws: Amend 11.6.2, pages 54-55, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football,
divided vote, roll call]

"11.6.2 Division I Restrictions. Except as provided in this section, a Division I member institution shall not pay or permit the payment of expenses incurred by its athletics department staff members or representatives (including professional scouting services) to scout its opponents or individuals who represent its opponents. **In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, off-campus, in-person scouting of opponents shall be prohibited.**

"11.6.2.1 Basketball, Football, Lacrosse and Women's Volleyball. In basketball, football, lacrosse and women's volleyball, it shall be permissible for the institution to pay the expenses of one person to scout each opponent on one occasion. Any coach can scout opponents at his or her own expense except in Division I football and Division I basketball, where volunteer or undergraduate student coaches may not scout opponents, regardless of whether they are compensated for such scouting (see 11.7.1.1.1.1).

[11.6.2.1.1 through 11.6.2.2 unchanged.]

"11.6.2.3 Complimentary Game Tickets. In sports other than basketball, football, lacrosse and women's volleyball, it is not permissible for a member institution's representative to receive press-box tickets or complimentary tickets from an opponent for the purpose of scouting the opponent. Not only is a member institution prohibited from paying expenses incurred in scouting, the member institution's staff member is prohibited from accepting payment of any expenses, even if they are provided by the institution being scouted.

"11.6.2.3.1 Basketball, Football, Lacrosse and Women's Volleyball. In basketball, football, lacrosse and women's volleyball, receipt of press-box tickets or complimentary tickets from an opponent shall constitute a countable scouting opportunity."

B. Bylaws: Amend 11.6.2, pages 54-55, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"11.6.2 Division I Restrictions. Except as provided in this section, a Division I member institution shall not pay or permit the payment of expenses incurred by its athletics department staff members or representatives (including professional scouting services) to scout its opponents or individuals who represent its opponents. **In Division I basketball, off-campus, in-person scouting of opponents shall be prohibited, except as specified in 11.6.2.1.1.**

"11.6.2.1 Basketball, Football, Lacrosse and Women's Volleyball. In basketball, football, lacrosse and women's volleyball, it shall be permissible for the institution to pay the expenses of one person to scout each opponent on one occasion. Any coach can scout opponents at his or her own expense except in Division I football and Division I basketball, where volunteer or undergraduate student coaches may not scout opponents, regardless of whether they are compensated for such scouting (see 11.7.1.1.1.1).

[11.6.2.1.1 through 11.6.2.2 unchanged.]

"11.6.2.3 Complimentary Game Tickets. In sports other than basketball, football, lacrosse and women's volleyball, it is not permissible for a member institution's representative to receive press-box tickets or complimentary tickets from an opponent for the purpose of scouting the opponent. Not only is a member institution prohibited from paying expenses incurred in scouting, the member institution's staff member is prohibited from accepting payment of any expenses, even if they are provided by the institution being scouted.

"11.6.2.3.1 Basketball, Football, Lacrosse and Women's Volleyball. In basketball, football, lacrosse and women's volleyball, receipt of press-box tickets or complimentary tickets from an opponent shall constitute a countable scouting opportunity."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: It is anticipated that the scouting of opponents in the sports of Divisions I-A and I-AA football and Division I basketball will occur by review of game films/videotapes. Institutions will save the expenses currently incurred by coaching staff members (or others) to travel to future opponents' games for scouting purposes. It is important to note that this proposal would preclude all in-person, off-campus scouting of opponents in Division I football and basketball and does not permit an individual to scout at his or her own expense.

Action: Part A adopted by Division I-A (112-2, one abstention) and Division I-AA (97-17, two abstentions). Part B adopted by Division I (279-50, two abstentions).

**NO. 25 (NO. 2-12) RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACH —
SUMMER COMPENSATION**

Intent: To eliminate the limitations on summer compensation or remuneration that a restricted-earnings coach may receive from an institution's athletics department, athletics organization, camp or clinic.

Bylaws: Amend 11.02.3, page 47, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"11.02.3 Restricted-Earnings Coach. A restricted-earnings coach is any coach who is designated by the institution's athletics department to perform coaching duties and who serves in that capacity on a volunteer or paid basis with the following limitations on earnings derived from the member institution:

[11.02.3-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) During the summer, a restricted-earnings coach may receive compensation or remuneration (total remuneration shall not exceed \$4,000) from:

"(1) The institution's athletics department or any organization funded in whole or in part by the athletics department or that is involved primarily in the promotion of the institution's athletics program (e.g., booster club, athletics foundation association);

"(2) The institution's camp or clinic,

"(3) Camps or clinics owned or operated by institutional employees, or

"(4) Another member institution's summer camp.

"(b) During the summer, there is no restriction on the amount of compensation or remuneration a restricted-earnings coach may receive from an institution's athletics department, athletics organization, camp or clinic, provided all such compensation or remuneration is approved in advance by the institution's athletics director.

[11.02.3-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Compensation for employment from a source outside the institution during the academic year or from sources other than those specified in 11.02.3-(b) and 11.02.3-(c) above during the summer shall be excluded from the individual's limit on remuneration."

[Remainder 11.02.3 unchanged.]

Source. Auburn University; Butler University; University of Evansville; George Washington University; Gonzaga University; University of Kansas; University of Kentucky; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of North Carolina, Wilmington; Rider College; St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania), and University of Wisconsin, Green Bay.

Effective Date: Immediately

Rationale: Original legislation concerning the restricted-earnings coach was intended to encourage the development of new coaches while limiting compensation provided to such coaches. Empirical data shows that the restricted-earnings position serves as

an entry-level opportunity for all coaches in general and for minority coaches in particular. This proposal permits flexibility for the restricted-earnings coach to receive minimal compensation or remuneration without increasing the financial commitment of the institution. Specifying that the athletics director must approve in advance any summer earnings decreases the likelihood of outside groups arranging for and providing questionable employment arrangements for restricted-earnings coaches.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The committee voted to oppose this proposal on the basis that it would eliminate the current limitations on summer compensation for a restricted-earnings coach.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 26 (NO. 2-11) RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACH

Intent: To specify that a restricted-earnings coach is limited to a three-consecutive-year period of combined service in that coaching category.

Bylaws: Amend 11.02.3, page 47, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"11.02.3 Restricted-Earnings Coach. A restricted-earnings coach is any coach who is designated by the institution's athletics department to perform coaching duties and, **who has not been employed in this coaching category for more than three consecutive years of combined service in Division I and who serves in that capacity on a volunteer or paid basis with the following limitations on earnings derived from the member institution:**"

[Remainder of 11.02.3 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal attempts to address many concerns that have been expressed regarding abuses in the hiring practices of restricted-earnings coaches. The current legislation does not reflect the original intent and purpose of the legislation. This proposal restricts an individual employed as a restricted-earnings coach to one who is seeking a Division I entry-level coaching position (i.e., the individual may not be employed for more than three years combined in this category at a Division I institution).

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The committee voted to oppose this proposal on the basis that it is sponsoring a similar proposal that relates only to the sport of basketball. The committee noted its concern that the majority of the abuses appear to have occurred in the sport of basketball, which is why its proposal is limited to that sport.

Action: Withdrawn.

***NO. 27 (NO. 2-13) RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACH**

Intent: To specify that a restricted-earnings coach in the sport of Division I basketball shall not have been employed previously as a head or assistant basketball coach in Division I and shall complete his or her period of employment as a restricted-earnings coach within three calendar years of the date of initial employment in such a position.

Bylaws: Amend 11.02.3 by adding new 11.02.3.1, page 47, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"11.02.3.1 Additional Limitations — Basketball. An individual who has not been employed previously as a head or assistant basketball coach in Division I may be employed as a restricted-earnings coach in that sport. The individual shall complete his or her period of employment as a restricted-earnings coach within three calendar years of the date of initial employment in such a position and shall not subsequently be employed as a restricted-earnings coach in Division I basketball."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee) and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Effective Date: Immediately; for individuals currently employed as restricted-earnings coaches, employment during the 1993-94 academic year shall be considered to have initiated the three-year period specified in the legislation.

Rationale: The restricted-earnings coaching category was established by a vote of the membership at the 1991 Convention in an effort to encourage the development of new coaches while more effectively limiting the compensation to such coaches. Since that time, the Interpretations Committee has issued a number of interpretations indicating that compensation provided to a restricted-earnings coach for involvement in various activities must be included in the coach's compensation limitations. Most of the interpretations resulted from efforts to retain current, experienced personnel by finding alternative compensation arrangements to supplement compensation from the athletics department. This proposal will ensure that the restricted-earnings coach in the sport of basketball truly is an entry-level position, which, in addition to cost savings, was the intent of the original legislation.

Action: Adopted as amended by 27-1 by Division I (234-91, two abstentions).

NO. 27-1 RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACH

Intent: To specify that a restricted-earnings coach in the sport of Division I basketball shall complete his or her period of employment as a restricted-earnings coach within five calendar years of the initial date of employment in such a position.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 27, 11.02.3.1, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"11.02.3.1 Additional Limitations — Basketball. An individual who has not been employed previously as a head or assistant basketball coach in Division I may be employed as a restricted-earnings coach in that sport. The individual shall complete his or her period of employment as a restricted-earnings coach within three five calendar years of the date of initial employment in such a position and shall not subsequently be employed as a restricted-earnings coach in Division I basketball."

Source: Arkansas State University; Auburn University; Gonzaga University; Illinois State University; University of Kansas; University of Kentucky; University of Louisville; Marquette University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Northern Illinois University; St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania), and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Rationale: A recent National Association of Basketball Coaches survey revealed that the average length of time for a graduate assistant or volunteer coach to advance to a full-time coaching position is 5.2 years. With the recent reduction of coaching staffs, there will be even fewer full-time positions available. A five-year "cap" is more reasonable.

Action: Adopted by Division I (304-24, two abstentions).

***NO. 28 (NO. 2-17) ATHLETICALLY RELATED INCOME**

Intent: To stipulate that all athletics department staff members in Divisions I and II must receive annually prior written approval from the institution's chief executive officer for all athletically related income and benefits from sources outside the institution, and to specify that the staff member's report of the amount and the source of the income also be in writing.

Bylaws: Amend 11.2.2, page 50, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A, all other Division I members and Division II, divided vote, roll call]

"11.2.2 Athletically Related Income. Contractual agreements, including letters of appointment, between a full-time or part-time coach athletics department staff member and an institution shall include the stipulation that the coach staff member is required to receive annually prior written approval from the chief executive officer for all athletically related income and benefits from sources outside the institution. The staff member's request for approval also shall be in writing and shall include the amount and the source of the income. Sources of such income shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

"11.2.2.1 Speaking Engagement/Camp or Clinic Participation. It is permissible for an institution's chief executive officer to grant general prior written approval for a coach staff member to receive income that does not exceed an institu-

tionally determined nominal amount (not to exceed \$500) for speaking engagements or for participation in a camp or clinic. A detailed accounting of all such income shall be provided annually **in writing** by the *coach staff member* to the chief executive officer."

[Remainder of 11.2.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal is consistent with the requirements of Bylaw 11.3.1, which state that the institution (as opposed to any outside source) shall remain in control of who is to be its employee and the amount of salary the employee is to receive within the restrictions specified by NCAA legislation. Such control will be established by requiring that all athletically related compensation from any source, including that which might now be paid directly to an athletics department staff member, be reported in writing to the institution's chief executive officer, who must issue prior written approval for the staff member to receive the income.

Action: Adopted by Division I-A (103-11), Division I other than I-A (192-21, one abstention) and Division II (158-49, three abstentions).

NO. 29 (NO. 2-27) COACHING LIMITATIONS — ICE HOCKEY

Intent: To establish a coaching limitation in Division I ice hockey of three head or assistant coaches, instead of one head coach, one assistant coach and one restricted-earnings coach.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.4, pages 57-58, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"11.7.4 Division I Sports Other Than Football — Limitations on Number. There shall be a limit on the number of coaches that may be employed by an institution in each sport (other than football) as follows:

	Head or Assistant Coach	Restricted- Earnings Coach
"Sport Ice Hockey	23	10"

[Remainder of 11.7.4 unchanged.]

Source: University of Alaska Anchorage; Colorado College; University of Denver; Michigan Technological University; University of Minnesota, Duluth; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; University of North Dakota; Northern Michigan University, and University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Effective Date: July 1, 1994.

Rationale: To guarantee the safety and general welfare of student-athletes and to ensure a productive and safe practice and game environment, the sport of ice hockey needs three full-time experienced coaches. A high-velocity contact sport such as ice hockey should have a player/coach ratio that does not exceed 12:1. Hockey uses 20 players full time in each contest and averages, by necessity, over 30 players on a roster; thus, there is a need for three full-time coaches. This proposal will ensure that athletes are properly coached and supervised during the course of the playing season and the recruiting periods. It also will permit hockey to have a number of comparable coaches as are already authorized for other revenue-producing sports.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The committee voted to oppose this proposal because it increases the number of head coaches in the sport of ice hockey and eliminates the restricted-earnings coach category in that sport.

Action: Withdrawn.

*NO. 30 (NO. 2-22) RECRUITING COORDINATOR — DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent: In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, to specify that all recruiting coordination functions (except routine clerical tasks) shall be performed by the head coach or one or more assistant coaches.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.1.1.1.1 by adding new 11.7.1.1.1.1, page 55, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football,
divided vote, roll call]

"11.7.1.1.1.1 Recruiting Coordinator Exception — Divisions I-A and I-AA Football. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, all recruiting coordination functions (except routine clerical tasks) must be performed by the head coach or one or more of the full-time assistant coaches."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics expressed particular concern about the proliferation of personnel other than on-field coaches in Division I football. One particular position that drew the committee's attention was that of recruiting coordinator. In particular, for most Division I-A football programs, the recruiting coordinator exists in addition to the 10 full-time coaching positions. By eliminating the football-specific recruiting coordinator, Division I institutions will save money.

Action: Adopted by Division I-A (74-36, one abstention) and Division I-AA (104-4, six abstentions).

***NO. 31 (NO. 2-25) OFF-CAMPUS RECRUITING —
DIVISION I FOOTBALL**

Intent: To specify that only the head coach and seven of the permissible number of full-time assistant coaches in Division I-A football and five of the permitted number of full-time assistant coaches in Division I-AA football may recruit off campus.

A. Bylaws: Amend 11.7.2.2, page 56, as follows:

[Division I-A football only, roll call]

"11.7.2.2 Contact and Evaluation of Prospects Limited to Full-Time Coaches. Only those coaches who are counted by the institution within the numerical limitations on full-time head and assistant coaches may contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus. In addition, there is a limit of seven coaches (including the head coach) who may contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus during any one calendar week (defined for purposes of this legislation as Sunday through Saturday) **off-campus contact and evaluation of prospective student-athletes is limited to the head coach and seven of the full-time assistant coaches.** The institution shall certify those individuals who fall within these number limitations and are thereby permitted to contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus **and such certification shall take place by October 1 and shall remain in effect for the year, except that a coach no longer employed by the institution may be replaced.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend 11.7.3.2, page 57, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only, roll call]

"11.7.3.2 Off-Campus Contact and Evaluation of Prospects. Off-campus contact and evaluation of prospects is limited to a total of seven coaches, which may include the head coach and not more than one restricted-earnings coach. A list of permissible off-campus recruiters shall be designated prior to October 1. The annual designation of the restricted-earnings coach shall remain in effect for the academic year or until the restricted-earnings coach no longer is employed by the institution **the head coach and five of the full-time assistant coaches. The institution shall certify those individuals who fall within these number limitations and are thereby permitted to contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus and such certification shall take place by October 1 and shall remain in effect for the year, except that a coach no longer employed by the institution may be replaced.**"

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: This proposal will reduce costs and, at the same time, allow some full-time coaching staff members to remain on campus during the academic year. Each staff member who may recruit off campus will be designated by October 1. As a result,

coaches can perform duties in other areas (e.g., strength and conditioning, academic support, recruiting coordination) that otherwise might require additional staff members.

Action: Part A defeated by Division I-A (47-63, one abstention). Part B defeated upon reconsideration by Division I-AA (37-67, 13 abstentions).

***NO. 32 (NO. 2-26) COACHING LIMITATIONS —
DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL**

Note: The NCAA Presidents Commission has submitted the following proposal for decision by the Division I-AA membership. While the Presidents Commission has not taken a position on the proposal, it believes the membership should have the opportunity to consider and vote on the proposal.

Intent: To reduce from seven to six the limit on head or assistant coaches in Division I-AA football.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.3, page 56, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only, roll call]

"11.7.3 Division I-AA Football. There shall be a limit of ~~seven~~ **six** head or assistant coaches and four restricted-earnings coaches that may be employed by the institution in the sport of Division I-AA football. The total compensation from sources specified in 11.02.3-(a) for all four restricted-earnings coaches may not exceed \$24,000 per academic year."

[Remainder of 11.7.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: This proposal is submitted as a cost-reduction measure.

Action: Defeated by Division I-AA (42-59, 18 abstentions).

**NO. 33 (NO. 2-40) CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS —
DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA FOOTBALL**

Intent: In Division I football, to specify that any visit to a prospect's school shall constitute a contact for a particular week, even if no contact is made with the prospect; to permit one contact per week at a prospect's home or educational institution; to specify that a visit to the prospect's school and home during the same calendar day shall be considered one contact; to specify that institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week; to establish a limit of seven in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect at any site; to limit staff members to two evaluations per prospect during the academic year and specify that not more than one evaluation may be used during the fall and May evaluation periods, respectively; to increase from 15 days to 20 days the length of the discretionary May evalua-

tion period, and to eliminate approximately 38 days from the total evaluation and recruiting periods.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.02.3, page 78, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"13.02.3 Contact. A contact is any face-to-face encounter between a prospect or the prospect's parent or legal guardian and an institutional staff member or athletics representative during which any dialogue occurs in excess of an exchange of a greeting. Any such face-to-face encounter that is prearranged or that takes place on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution or at the site of organized competition or practice involving the prospect or the prospect's high school, preparatory school, two-year college or all-star team shall be considered a contact, regardless of the conversation that occurs. **In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, any visit to a prospect's high school, preparatory school or two-year college during a contact period shall constitute a contact for that particular week even if no contact was made with a prospect.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.4.2, page 85, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"13.1.4.2 Visits During Contact Period — Divisions I-A and I-AA Football. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, *institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than three days during the football contact period* **one contact per prospect is permitted during each week of the contact period as specified in Bylaw 30.10.5 either at the prospect's home or educational institution. A visit to the prospect's educational institution and at the prospect's home during the same calendar day shall be considered one contact. In addition, institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of prospects enrolled in the institution.**"

C. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.5, pages 85-86, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"13.1.5 Permissible Number of Contacts. **In sports other than Divisions I-A and I-AA football, each institution shall be limited to three in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect at any site (which shall include contacts made with the prospect's relatives or legal guardians but shall not include contacts made during an official visit per 13.7). In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, each institution shall be limited to seven in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect at any site (which shall include contacts made with the prospect's relatives or legal guardians, but shall not in-**

clude contacts made during an official visit per 13.7)."

[Remainder of 13.1.5 unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.7, pages 86-87, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"13.1.7 Limitations on Number of Evaluations — All Sports. Institutional staff members **in sports other than Divisions I-A and I-AA football** shall not evaluate a prospective student-athlete on more than four occasions during the academic year during which the prospect competes or practices on any team (e.g., high-school team, all-star team, club team). **In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, institutional staff members shall be limited to two evaluations during the academic year during which the prospect competes or practices on any team. Not more than one evaluation may be used during the fall evaluation period and not more than one evaluation may be used during the May evaluation period per Bylaw 30.10.5.**"

[Remainder of 13.1.7 unchanged.]

E. Bylaws: Amend 30.10.5, page 387, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"30.10.5 Football, Division I. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to football in Division I:

"(a) June 1 through *October 31* **November** Quiet Period
30 [except for (1) below]:

"(1) *Fridays during the month of October* **Nine days during the months of October and November selected at the discretion of the institution (an authorized off-campus recruiter may visit a particular high school only once during this evaluation period):** Evaluation Period

"(b) *November 1 through November 30:* Evaluation Period

"(c) (b) December 1 through December 23 [as provided in (1) below]: Contact Period

"(1) **One in-person off-campus contact with a prospective student-athlete shall be permitted during each calendar week (Sunday through Saturday) or partial calendar week.**

"(d) (c) December 24 through January 1 (or January 2 if January 1 falls on a Sunday): Dead Period

"(e) (d) January 2 through the Monday following the initial date for the signing of the National Letter of Intent **Any seven consecutive days [excluding the days specified in (1) and (2) below] from January 2 through January 16 (or January 3 through January 16 if January 1 falls on a Sunday) during which only one in-person off-campus contact per prospective student-athlete shall be permitted [except for (1) and (2) and (3) below]:**

Contact Period

"(1) **The day before registration day for the annual convention of the American Football Coaches Association and the day after the completion of the convention:**

Quiet Period

"(1) (2) 12:01 a.m. on the day of registration of the annual convention of the American Football Coaches Association to 12:01 a.m. on the day after completion of the convention:

Dead Period

"(2) *During the period 48 hours before and 48 hours after 8 a.m. on the date for signing the National Letter of Intent (the National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this time, it must be mailed):*

"(3) **The remainder of the days from January 2 (or January 3) through January 16:**

Quiet Period

"(e) **January 17 to January 29 [as provided in (1) below]:**

Contact Period

"(1) **Only one in-person off-campus contact per prospective student-athlete shall be permitted during this time:**

"(f) **January 30 through the period ending 48 hours prior to the date for the signing of the National Letter of Intent:**

Quiet Period

"(e) (g) *During the period 48 hours before and 48 hours after 8 a.m. on the date for signing the National Letter of Intent (the National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this time; it must be mailed):*

Dead Period

"(f) (h) **The Tuesday following the initial During the period 48 hours after 8 a.m. on the date for the signing of the National Letter of Intent through April 30:**

Quiet Period

"(g) (i) *Fifteen consecutive Twenty days (excluding Memorial Day and Sundays and, at the institution's discretion, excluding Saturdays) during May 1 through May 31 selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics [as provided in (1) below]:*

Evaluation Period

"(1) **An authorized off-campus recruiter may visit a particular high school only one time during this evaluation period:**

"(h) (j) *Those days in May not designated in (g) (i) above for evaluation opportunities:*

Quiet Period"

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; Brigham Young University; University of Cincinnati; Colorado State University; University of Hawaii; University of Houston; University of Louisville; Memphis State University; Mississippi State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Rice University; Texas A&M University; Texas Christian University, and West Virginia University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: This proposal permits Divisions I-A and I-AA football staffs adequate opportunities during the recruiting periods to personally assimilate information on the character of prospective student-athletes. This proposal is consistent with the Presidents Commission's reform movement regarding cost containment in that it eliminates approximately 38 days (266 "person days") from the football recruiting calendar.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee voted to support this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division I-A (84-27, one abstention) and Division I-AA (93-24, one abstention).

***NO. 34 (NO. 2-42) CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS — DIVISION I FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL**

Intent: To reduce the number of off-campus evaluations per prospective student-athlete in Division I football and basketball from four to two and to permit a member of the appropriate sport coaching staff to visit each high school only once per week during an evaluation period.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.7, page 86, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"13.1.7 Limitation on Number of Evaluations — All Sports. In sports other than football, institutional staff members shall not evaluate a prospective student-athlete on more than four occasions during the academic year during which the prospect competes or practices on any team (e.g., high-school team, all-star team, club team). In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, institutional staff members are limited to two evaluations per prospective student-athlete during the academic year."

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.7, page 86, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"13.1.7 Limitation on Number of Evaluations — All Sports. In sports other than basketball, institutional staff members shall not evaluate a prospective student-athlete on more than four occasions during the academic year during which the prospect competes or practices on any team (e.g., high-school team, all-star team, club team). In Division I basketball, institutional staff members are limited to two evaluations per prospective student-athlete during the academic year."

C. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.4 by adding new 13.1.4.2, page 85, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"13.1.4 Visit to Prospect's Educational Institution. Institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week within a contact period, regardless of the number of prospects enrolled in the institution or whether any prospect is contacted on that occasion."

[13.1.4.1 unchanged.]

"13.1.4.2 Visits During Evaluation Period — Division I Football. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week within an evaluation period."

[13.1.4.2 through 13.1.4.5, renumbered as 13.1.4.3 through 13.1.4.6, unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.4 by adding new 13.1.4.2, page 85, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"13.1.4 Visit to Prospect's Educational Institution. Institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week within a con-

tact period, regardless of the number of prospects enrolled in the institution or whether any prospect is contacted on that occasion.

[13.1.4.1 unchanged.]

"13.1.4.2 Visits During Evaluation Period — Division I Basketball. In Division I basketball, institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week within an evaluation period."

[13.1.4.2 through 13.1.4.5, renumbered as 13.1.4.3 through 13.1.4.6, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Institutions can reduce expenditures in their intercollegiate athletics programs by further limiting the number of evaluations per prospective student-athlete in football and men's and women's basketball. It is anticipated that the additional evaluation of prospective student-athletes can take place by the review of game tapes.

Action: Parts A and C in Division I-A moot. Parts B and D adopted by Division I (216-105, seven abstentions).

***NO. 35 (NO. 2-41) DIVISION I FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL — RECRUITING CALENDARS**

Intent: To limit the recruiting calendars in Division I football and basketball as specified.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.7, pages 86-87, by adding new 13.1.7.4, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"13.1.7.4 Person-Day Limitations — Division I Men's and Women's Basketball. In Division I men's and women's basketball, evaluation of prospective student-athletes is limited to an established number of 'person days' for each institution as set forth in 30.10.1 and 30.10.2. In determining person days, an institution must count for each institutional staff member each calendar day (defined as 12:01 a.m. to midnight) during which the staff member is engaged in the evaluation of any prospect. The combined total of such days for all staff members shall not exceed the limitations set forth in 30.10."

B. Bylaws: Amend 30.10.1, page 385, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"30.10.1 Basketball, Division I Men's. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to men's basketball in Division I"

"(a) August 1 through September 10 **September 8:**

"(b) September 11 **September 9** through October 10 **September 26:**

"(c) October 11 through November 30 [except for (1) below].

"(1) During the period 48 hours before and 48 hours after 8 a.m. on the initial date for the fall signing of the National Letter of Intent (the National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this time; it must be mailed).

"(c) September 27 through October 20:

"(d) October 21 through March 15 [except for (1) and (2) below] — Twenty person days selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics; institutional staff members shall not visit a prospect's educational institution on more than one calendar day during this period:

"(1) During the period 48 hours before and 48 hours after 8 a.m. on the initial date for the fall signing of the National Letter of Intent (the National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this time; it must be mailed):

"(2) Those days during October 21 through March 15 not designated in (d) above as 'person days' for evaluation purposes:

"(d) December 1 through December 11:

"(e) December 12 through January 19:

"(f) January 20 through January 30:

"(g) January 31 through February 17:

"(h) February 18 through the last day in February.

"(i) March 1 through March 3.

"(j) (e) March 4 **March 16** through March 22:

"(k) (f) March 23 through 8 a.m. on the first Wednesday following the National Collegiate Division I Men's Basketball Championship game [except for (1) below]:

Quiet Period

Contact Period

Quiet Period

Dead Period

Quiet Period
Evaluation Period

Dead Period

Quiet Period

Evaluation Period

Quiet Period

Evaluation Period

Quiet Period

Evaluation Period

Quiet Period

Contact Period

Quiet Period

"(1) Thursday prior to the National Collegiate Division I Men's Basketball Championship game to Tuesday noon after the game:

"(j) (g) The first Wednesday (8 a.m.) following the National Collegiate Division I Men's Basketball Championship game through ~~nine~~ **seven** days following the initial date for the spring signing of the National Letter of Intent [except for (1) below]:

"(1) During the period 48 hours before and 48 hours after 8 a.m. on the date for the spring signing of the National Letter of Intent (the National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this time; it must be mailed):

"(m) (h) ~~Nine~~ **Seven** days following the initial date for the spring signing of the National Letter of Intent through May 31:

"(n) (i) June 1 through July 4 **July 7:**

"(o) (j) July 5 **July 8** through July 31:

C. Bylaws: Amend 30.10.2, pages 385-386, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"30.10.2 Basketball, Division I Women's. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to women's basketball in Division I:

"(a) August 1 through September 16:

"(b) September 17 through October 7:

"(c) October 8 through November 30 [except for (1) below]

"(1) During the period 48 hours before and 48 hours after 8 a.m. on the initial date for the fall signing of the National Letter of Intent (the National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this time; it must be mailed):

"(c) October 8 through February 28 [except for (1) and (2) below] — Twenty person days selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics; institutional staff members shall not visit

Dead Period

Contact Period

Dead Period

Quiet Period

Quiet Period
Evaluation Period"

Quiet Period

Contact Period

Quiet Period

Dead Period

Evaluation Period

a prospect's educational institution on more than one calendar day during this period [except for (1) below]:

- "(1) During the period 48 hours before and 48 hours after 8 a.m. on the initial date for the fall signing of the National Letter of Intent (the National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this time; it must be mailed):**

Dead Period
- "(d) First Monday through first Saturday in December**

"(2) Those days during October 8 through February 28 not designated in (c) above as 'person days' for evaluation purposes:

Evaluation Period

Quiet Period
- "(e) Tuesday through Saturday prior to Christmas**

"(d) March 1 through midnight Tuesday prior to the National Collegiate Division I Women's Basketball Championship game [except for (1) below] — Eight days selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics:

Evaluation Period

Contact Period
- "(f) December 27 through December 30:**

"(1) Those days during March 1 through the Tuesday prior to the Division I Women's Basketball Championship game not designated in (d) above for contact purposes:

Evaluation Period

Quiet Period
- "(g) Those days in December not designated for evaluation periods.**

Quiet Period
- "(h) January 1 through January 16:**

Quiet Period
- "(e) Wednesday prior to the National Collegiate Division I Women's Basketball Championship game to Monday noon after the game:**

Dead Period
- "(i) January 17 through January 24:**

Evaluation Period
- "(f) Monday noon after the completion of the National Collegiate Division I Women's Basketball Championship game through the period 48 hours before the initial**

Contact Period

date for the spring signing of the National Letter of Intent:

- "(j) January 25 through February 7:**

Quiet Period

Dead Period
- "(g) During the period 48 hours before and 48 hours after 8 a.m. on the initial date for the spring signing of the National Letter of Intent (the National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this time; it must be mailed):**

Evaluation Period

Contact Period
- "(k) February 8 through the last day in February.**

Evaluation Period
- "(l) March 1 through April 16 [except for (1) and (2) below]:**

Dead Period
- "(1) Wednesday prior to the National Collegiate Division I Women's Basketball Championship game to Monday noon after the game:**

Dead Period
- "(2) During the period 48 hours before and 48 hours after 8 a.m. on the date for the signing of the National Letter of Intent (the National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this time, it must be mailed).**

Dead Period
- "(m) (h) April 17 During the period 48 hours after 8 a.m. on the initial date for signing the spring National Letter of Intent through May 31;**

Quiet Period
- "(n) (i) June 1 through July 7:**

Quiet Period
- "(o) (j) July 8 through July 31:**

Evaluation Period
- "(p) (k) During the National Junior College Athletic Association and Amateur Athletic Union women's national basketball championship competitions:**

Evaluation Period
- "(q) (l) During official tryouts for the USA Basketball Olympic Festival:**

Evaluation Period
- "(r) In the states of Michigan, West Virginia and South Dakota, evaluations shall be permissible only between July 8 and July 31 and between November 20 and December 10.**

Evaluation Period
- "(s) In the state of Montana, evaluations shall be permissible only between July 8 and July 31 and November 18 through December 8.**

Evaluation Period
- "(t) In classifications A and AA in the state of Virginia, evaluations shall be permissible only between July 8 and July 31 and between November 2 and November 22.**

Evaluation Period
- "(m) The following state-specific evaluation times are permissible, provided evaluations outside of the July period are counted toward the person-day limitation set forth in (c):**

Evaluation Period

"(u) (1) In the state of Hawaii, evaluations shall be permissible only between July 8 and July 31 and between April 17 and May 7.

"(v) (2) In those states that play the high-school basketball season in the spring, except for Hawaii, evaluations shall be permissible only between July 8 and July 31 and between April 8 and April 28."

D. Bylaws: Amend 30.10.5, page 387, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"30.10.5 Football, Division I. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to football in Division I:

"(a) June 1 through October 31 **September** Quiet Period
30 [except for (1) below]:

"(1) Fridays during the month of October. Evaluation Period

"(b) November 1 through November 30. Evaluation Period

"(b) **October 1 through November 30** Evaluation Period
[except for (1) below] — Nine days selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics:

"(1) Those days during October 1 through November 30 not designated in (b) above for evaluation purposes: Quiet Period

"(c) December 1 through December 23: Contact Period

"(d) December 24 through January 1: Dead Period

"(e) January 2 through the Monday following the initial date for the signing of the National Letter of Intent [except for (1) and (2) below]: Contact Period

"(1) 12:01 a.m. on the day of registration of the annual convention of the American Football Coaches Association to 12:01 a.m. on the day after completion of the convention: Dead Period

"(2) During the period 48 hours before and 48 hours after 8 a.m. on the date for signing the National Letter of Intent (the National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this time; it must be mailed): Dead Period

"(f) The Tuesday following the initial date for the signing of the National Letter of Intent through April 30: Quiet Period

"(g) **May 1 through May 31 [except (1) below]** — Fifteen consecutive days (excluding Memorial Day and Sundays and, at the institution's discretion, excluding Saturdays) during May 1 through May 31 selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics; **institutional staff members shall not visit a prospect's educational institution on more than one calendar day:**

Evaluation Period

"(h) (1) Those days in May not designated in (g) above for evaluation purposes:

Quiet Period"

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The primary objective of the reductions in the recruiting calendars recommended by the special committee is cost reduction. The special committee decided to support a modified "person day" concept for both men's and women's basketball. Such an approach leaves a substantial period of time during which off-campus recruiting activities can take place but permits each institution only a limited number of person days during the recruiting evaluation periods during which evaluation actually can occur. In determining "person days," an institution shall count each calendar day for each coach who is engaged in off-campus evaluation. Although the special committee is concerned that the new calendars may be slightly more complex for record-keeping purposes, it was noted that all recruiting activity in Division I basketball is already the subject of substantial record keeping and the changes would result in different, but not necessarily more complicated, tracking.

Action: Parts A through C as amended by 35-1 adopted by Division I (250-71, three abstentions). Part D in Division I-A moot.

NO. 35-1

DIVISION I FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL — RECRUITING CALENDARS

Intent: To eliminate the designation of "person days" in the recruiting limitations specified in Proposal No. 35 and to require an institution to designate a maximum number of days to be used for evaluation purposes.

A. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 35-A, 13.1.7.4, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"13 1 7 4 Person-Day Limitations — Division I Men's and Women's Basketball In Division I men's and women's basketball, evaluation of prospective student-athletes is limited to an established number of 'person days' for each institution as set forth in 30.10.1 and 30.10.2. In determining person days, an institution must count for each institutional staff member each calendar day (defined as 12:01 a.m. to midnight) during which the staff member is engaged in the evaluation of any prospect. The combined total of such days for all staff members shall not exceed the limitations set forth in 30.10."

B. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 35-B, 30.10.1, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"30.10.1 Basketball, Division I Men's. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to men's basketball in Division I:

[30.10.1-(a) through 30.10.1-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) October 21 through March 15 Evaluation Period
[except for (1) and (2) below] —

Twenty person days selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics; institutional staff members shall not visit a prospect's educational institution on more than one calendar day during this period:

[30.10.1-(d)-(1) unchanged.]

"(2) Those days during October Quiet Period"
21 through March 15 not designated in (d) above as 'person days' for evaluation purposes.

[Remainder of 30.10.1 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 35-C, 30.10.2, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"30.10.2 Basketball, Division I Women's. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to women's basketball in Division I:

[30.10.2-(a) and 30.10.2-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) October 8 through February 28 Evaluation Period
[except for (1) and (2) below] —

Twenty person days selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics; institutional staff members shall not visit a prospect's educational institution on more than one calendar

day during this period [except for (1) below]:

[30.10.2-(c)-(1) unchanged.]

"(2) Those days during October 8 through February 28 not designated in (c) above as person days for evaluation purposes:

[Remainder of 30.10.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee), Auburn University and University of Louisville.

Rationale: Eliminating the designation of "person days" will simplify the application of the proposed recruiting calendar without compromising the overall objectives of the proposed legislation.

Action: Adopted by Division I (290-30, two abstentions).

NO. 36 (NO. 2-150) CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS — DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent: To limit the Division I football recruiting periods as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 30.10.5, page 387, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"30.10.5 Football, Division I. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to football in Division I:

"(a) June 1 through October 31 November Quiet Period
30 [except for (1) below]:

"(1) Fridays during the month of October Evaluation Period

"(b) November 1 through November 30 Evaluation Period

"(c)(b) December 1 through December 23 Contact Period
December 15: Evaluation Period

"(c) December 16 through December 23: Quiet Period

"(d) December 24 through January 1: Dead Period

"(e) January 2 through Monday following the initial date for the signing of the National Letter of Intent January 14 [except for (1) and (2) below]: Contact Period

"(1) 12:01 a.m. on the day of registration of the annual convention of the American Football Coaches Association to 12:01 a.m. on the day after completion of the convention: Quiet Period

"(f) January 15 through March 15 [except for (1) below]: Dead Period

"(2)(1) During the period 48 hours

after 8 a.m. on the date for signing the National Letter of Intent (the National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this time; it must be mailed):

"(f) The Tuesday following the initial date for the signing of the National Letter of Intent through April 30.

Quiet Period

"(g) Fifteen consecutive days (excluding Memorial Day and Sundays and, at the institution's discretion, excluding Saturdays) during May 1 through May 31 selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics"

Evaluation Period

"(h) Those days in May not designated in (g) above for evaluation purposes.

Quiet Period

"(g) March 16 through May 31, except for (f)-(1) above:

Quiet Period"

Source: All members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: This proposal is intended to provide an effective and efficient recruiting calendar in Division I football that also drastically slashes costs. It confines the evaluation period to the first 15 days of December and the contact period to a two-month period ending March 15. With a National Letter of Intent signing date of March 16, institutions would have access to the prospect's seventh-semester high-school transcript before the signing date, assuring a more complete review of the prospect's academic record. All off-campus football recruiting would conclude by March 15, thus permitting institutions to conduct their spring football practices during late spring without recruiting interruptions.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Moot.

NO. 37 (NO. 2-151) CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS — DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent. To reduce the number of off-campus recruiting and evaluation days in Division I football from 101 to 73.

Bylaws: Amend 30.10.5, page 387, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"30.10.5 Football, Division I. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to football in Division I:

"(a) June 1 through October 31 November 30 [except for (1) below]:

Quiet Period

(1) Fridays during the month of October **Nine days during the months of October and November selected at the discretion of the institution:**

Evaluation Period

"(b) November 1 through November 30:

Evaluation Period

[30.10.5-(c) and 30.10.5-(d), relettered as 30.10.5-(b) and 30.10.5-(c), unchanged.]

"(e)(d) January 2 through the Monday following the initial date for the signing of the National Letter of Intent [except for (1) and (2) below]:

Contact Period

[30.10.5-(e)-(1) and 30.10.5-(e)-(2), relettered as 30.10.5-(d)-(1) and 30.10.5-(d)-(2), unchanged.]

"(f)(e) The Tuesday day following the initial date for the signing of the National Letter of Intent through April 30:

Quiet Period"

[30.10.5-(g) and 30.10.5-(h), relettered as 30.10.5-(f) and 30.10.5-(g), unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Effective Date: February 15, 1994.

Rationale: This proposal reduces the number of off-campus contact and evaluation days in Division I football from 101 to 73 by eliminating the four allowable contact days after the National Letter of Intent signing date and limiting institutions to nine days, selected at the discretion of the institution, for off-campus recruiting activities during the months of October and November. It reduces the football recruiting calendar in a meaningful way while providing institutions with flexibility in determining when they will engage in off-campus recruiting during the months of October and November.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Moot.

*NO. 38 (NO. 2-44) OFFICIAL VISITS — DIVISION I FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL

Intent: To reduce the total number of official visits permitted annually in Division I football from 70 to 56 and in Division I basketball from 15 to 12 and to establish a waiver process for instances in which a head coaching change occurs after nearly all the permitted official visits have been utilized.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.1.6, page 95, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"13.7.1.6 Number of Official Visits — Institutional Limitation. The total number of official visits a Division I institution may provide prospects in the following sports during an academic year shall be limited to:

"(a) Football — 70 56."

[Remainder of 13.7.1.6 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.1.6, page 95, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"13.7.1.6 Number of Official Visits — Institutional Limitation. The total number of official visits a Division I institution may provide prospects in the following sports during an academic year shall be limited to:

[13.7.1.6-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Basketball — 15 12."

[Remainder of 13.7.1.6 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.1.6 by adding new 13.7.1.6.4, page 95, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"13.7.1.6.4 Waiver of Institutional Limitation — Head Coaching Change. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant a waiver of the limit on paid visits for an institution that has made a head coaching change in football or basketball after the institution has utilized all or nearly all of the permitted official visits in that sport. Such a waiver request shall be submitted by the institution's director of athletics. If the waiver request is granted, the Council shall establish an appropriate additional number of visits."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Further limitations on the number of official visits in Division I football and basketball are proposed for cost-reduction purposes. Many institutions do not approach the current limitations on official visits, and the proposed limits remain high enough to accommodate the concerns of those institutions that bring larger numbers of prospects to campus for official visits. For those circumstances when more visits are needed because of a change in the head coach, a waiver provision will be available.

Action: Part A adopted by Division I-A (61-44, one abstention); adopted as amended by 38-1 by Division I-AA (91-23, five abstentions). Parts B and C adopted by Division I (237-90).

NO. 38-1

**OFFICIAL VISITS — DIVISION I
FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL**

Intent: To specify that a Division I institution that does not sub-

A-68 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

scribe to the National Letter of Intent may provide 70 official visits in the sport of football, 56 of which may be provided prior to the initial National Letter of Intent signing date.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 38-A, 13.7.1.6, by adding new 13.7.1.6.1, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"13.7.1.6.1 Exception — Division I Institution That Does Not Subscribe to the National Letter of Intent. A Division I institution that does not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent may provide 70 official visits in the sport of football, 56 of which may be provided prior to the initial National Letter of Intent signing date."

[13.7.1.6.1 through 13.7.1.6.3, renumbered as 13.7.1.6.2 through 13.7.1.6.4, unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Rationale: An institution that does not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent does not have a binding commitment from any prospect and, therefore, must recruit a greater number of prospects to yield the same number of incoming freshmen. The additional visits would occur after the National Letter of Intent signing date.

Action: Not moved in Division I-A; adopted in Division I-AA (97-15, five abstentions).

***NO. 39 (NO. 2-45) OFFICIAL VISIT — MEALS**

Intent: To specify that meals provided to a prospect during an official visit must occur in regular, on-campus institutional dining facilities.

Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.8, page 96, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and III, divided vote, roll call]

"13.7.5.8 Meals on Official Visit — Divisions I and III. Meals provided for a prospect and the prospect's parents or legal guardians on an official visit must occur in the institution's regular, on-campus dining facilities. If all such dining facilities are closed, the institution may provide meals off-campus. The cost of actual meals, not to exceed three per day, on the official visit for the prospect and the prospect's parents or legal guardians need not be included in the \$20-per-day entertainment expense. A dessert or after-dinner snack at the coach's residence also may be excluded."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: This legislation will reduce the high costs of providing prospects with meals at off-campus dining facilities during official visits to an institution's campus.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-69

Action: Adopted by Division I (182-141, five abstentions) and Division III (266-9).

***NO. 40 (Dereg. 7) RECRUITING MATERIALS**

Note: The following two proposals are part of the recruiting "deregulation package" that is being sponsored by the NCAA Council. The proposals are placed here because they also are being sponsored by the NCAA Presidents Commission. The remainder of the recruiting deregulation package is found in Proposal Nos. 162-173.

Intent: In Divisions I and II, to amend the legislation related to recruiting materials that may be provided to a prospect as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 13.4, pages 89-90, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"13.4 RECRUITING MATERIALS

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Permissible Items Printed Recruiting Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the following printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. **A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, game programs, newspaper clippings):**

"(a) Correspondence. General correspondence, including letters, **postcards issued by the U.S. postal service (i.e., blank cards) and institutional note cards** and regular (not specialized) cards that do not include pictures of the institution's department of athletics personnel or enrolled student-athletes, may be sent to a prospect.

"(b) Drug-Education or Drug-Testing Information. An institution may provide drug-education or drug-testing information (except through posters) to a prospect.

"(c) Game Programs. Game programs may not include posters. In Division I, game programs may be provided to prospects only during official and unofficial recruiting visits to campus and may not be mailed.

"(d)(b) NCAA Educational Information. An institution may provide educational information published by the NCAA (e.g., NCAA Guide for the College-Bound Student-Athlete) to a prospect.

"(e) Newspaper Clippings. Newspaper clippings may be sent to a prospect, but may not be assembled in any form of scrapbook.

"(f) Postcards, Note Cards. The only postcards an institution may provide to a prospect are those issued by the U.S. Postal Service (i.e., blank cards) or institutional note cards.

"(g)(c) Preenrollment Information. Any necessary preenrollment information regarding orientation, conditioning, academics and practice activities may be sent to a prospect, provided the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent or has

been officially accepted for enrollment by a member institution that does not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent program.

"(h) Promotional Handbill, Poster. An institution may send a prospect a small handbill promoting a specific institutional or conference athletics program or event. An institution or conference that hosts any portion of an NCAA or conference championship may provide a poster (produced by the institution, conference or NCAA) promoting the championship to a high school, but not to a specific prospect.

"(i) Publications (Athletics) In addition to game programs, an institution may produce either a recruiting brochure or media guide (but not both) in each sport it sponsors and provide it to a prospect. The publication may have only one color of printing inside the covers.

"(1) Nonrecruiting Publications. An institution may produce additional athletics publications (other than an additional media guide or recruiting brochure) unrelated to the recruitment of prospective student-athletes.

"(2) Additional Media Publications. An institution may produce additional media publications (e.g., postseason media guide, preseason prospectus, spring football practice guide), provided the additional publications are not provided to prospects.

"(j)(d) Publications (Nonathletics) Available to All Students. Official academic, admissions and student-services publications published or videotapes produced by the institution and available to all students may be provided to prospects.

"(k)(e) Questionnaires. Questionnaires may be provided to a prospect and may be sent prior to September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school.

"(l) Schedule Cards. One wallet-size playing schedule per sport may be provided to a prospect.

"(m) Student-Athlete Handbook. One student-athlete handbook, describing the institution's athletics department policies governing the conduct of student-athletes, may be provided to a prospect. The handbook may contain only one color of printing throughout the publication, including the cover.

"(n)(f) Summer Camp Brochures. Summer camp brochures may be provided to a prospect and may be sent prior to September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school.

"13.4.1.1 Responding to Prospect's Request. Institutional staff members (including athletics staff members) may respond to a prospect's letter requesting information from an institution's athletics department prior to September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school, provided the written response does not include information that would initiate the recruitment of the prospect or information related to the institution's athletics program (e.g., the reply contains an explanation of current NCAA legislation or a referral to the admissions department).

"13.4.2 Divisions I and II — Nonpermissible Items. A Division I or II institution may not provide the following materials to prospects or to coaches of prospects:

- "(a) Greeting Cards. An institution may not provide greeting cards (e.g., birthday cards, holiday cards) to a prospect or the prospect's coach
- "(b) Highlight Film or Videotape. An institution may show a film or videotape to a prospect or the prospect's coach but may not send it to or leave it with the prospect or coach
- "(c) Posters. An institution may not provide a poster to an individual prospect or coach, or to the prospect's high school, except as permitted in 13.4.1-(h).
- "(d) Press Release. An institution may not provide an athletics department press release to a prospect or to a high-school or two-year college coach.
- "(e) Recruiting Videotape. An institution may not provide a recruiting videotape to a prospect or to a prospect's coach. An institution is limited to producing one recruiting videotape per sport, with a single generic introduction (i.e., the same introduction for each sport) and a maximum of three minutes related to any sport. It is not permissible to utilize any personalized recruiting videotape or audio tape in the recruitment of prospects on or off the institution's campus. An institution may continue to show to prospects a recruiting videotape that does not meet the provisions of this paragraph, provided the videotape was produced prior to January 11, 1991. Once the institution produces a new recruiting videotape, it may no longer utilize the previous videotape.
- "(f) Subscriptions to Publications. Subscriptions to newspapers, magazines or other publications may not be provided to prospects.
- "(g) Tangible Recruiting Aids. The gift of any tangible recruiting aid other than those specified in 13.4.1 shall be considered an improper recruiting inducement. A "tangible" recruiting aid is any item having a value in and of itself. Further, the provision of other printed materials (e.g., calendars, books, pictures or posters) or material items bearing the institution's insignia (e.g., mugs, pencil holders, key chains) is prohibited.
- "(h) Telegrams. An institution may not send a telegram to a prospect, inasmuch as such communication is not considered general correspondence.

"13.4.2 Divisions I and II — Video Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not produce video materials to show or send to a prospect except as specified in 13.4.2.1.

"13.4.2.1 Highlight Film or Videotape. An institution may show a highlight film or videotape to a prospect or the prospect's coach but may not send it to or leave it with the prospect or coach.

"13.4.3 Conference Restrictions. A member conference is precluded from providing printed recruiting materials to prospects except as specified in this section.

"13.4.3.1 Permissible Items. A member conference may provide drug-education or drug-testing information, NCAA educational publications (e.g., NCAA Guide for the College-Bound Student-Athlete) and small handbills (not posters) promoting a specific conference athletics program or event to a prospect.

"13.4.3.2 Highlight Films. The restrictions on institutional highlight films in 13.4.2-(b) are applicable to member conferences.

"13.4.3.3 Recruiting Videotape. If an institution utilizes a conference recruiting videotape as its recruiting videotape, the restrictions set forth in 13.4.2-(e) shall apply to the conference recruiting videotape

"13.4.3.4 Correspondence. Correspondence from member conferences for purposes of recruitment is prohibited."

[Remainder of 13.4 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The area of printed recruiting materials is arguably one of the most over-regulated areas within NCAA recruiting legislation. While originally adopted as a cost-saving measure, the legislation has led to a plethora of detailed questions from the membership, which has necessitated the issuance of a number of interpretations. The Legislative Review Committee has chosen to incorporate a substantial number of those interpretations into the Manual in order to assist the membership in complying with the legislation; however, this has resulted in two pages of the Manual being devoted to this one specific area. The committee's proposal significantly reduces the list of permissible printed and video recruiting materials, and eliminates the list of nonpermissible recruiting materials; therefore, if a recruiting item is not included in the "permissible" list, it may not be given to a prospect. The committee believes that such an approach will maintain cost controls while making it clearer to institutions what can and cannot be provided to prospects, and should limit the number of interpretations that must be issued related to this regulation.

Action: Adopted as amended by 40-1 by Division I (277-45, four abstentions); adopted, upon reconsideration, as amended by 40-2 by Division II (201-10, one abstention).

NO. 40-1

RECRUITING MATERIALS

Intent: To permit a Division I institution to provide game programs to a prospect during official and unofficial visits and to produce either a recruiting brochure or media guide in each sport and provide the publication to a prospect, provided the publication has only one color of printing inside the covers.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 40, 13.4, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"13.4 RECRUITING MATERIALS

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Printed Recruiting Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, game programs, newspaper clippings):

[13.4.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Programs. Game programs may not include posters. Game programs may be provided to prospects only during official and unofficial recruiting visits and may not be mailed."

[13.4.1-(c) and 13.4.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Publications (Athletics). An institution may produce either a recruiting brochure or media guide (but not both) in each sport it sponsors and provide it to a prospect. The publication may have only one color of printing inside the covers."

[13.4.1-(e) and 13.4.1-(f), relettered as 13.4.1-(f) and 13.4.1-(g), unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Rationale: The use and cost of these materials vary across different sports and institutions. These publications can be cost-effective and provide information to wide audiences, especially where media exposure is limited.

Action: Adopted by Division I (191-127, seven abstentions).

NO. 40-2 RECRUITING MATERIALS

Intent: To permit an institution to produce either a recruiting brochure or media guide in each sport that it sponsors and provide it to a prospect, and to specify that the publication may have only one color of printing inside the covers.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 40, 13.4, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"13.4 RECRUITING MATERIALS

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Printed Recruiting Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, game programs, newspaper clippings):

[13.4.1-(a) through 13.4.1-(c), unchanged.]

"(d) Publications (Athletics). An institution may produce either a recruiting brochure or media guide (but not both) in each sport it sponsors and provide it to a prospect. The publication may have only one color of printing inside the covers."

[13.4.1-(d) through 13.4.1-(f), relettered as 13.4.1-(e) through 13.4.1-(g), unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Rationale: Even if expensive "recruiting" game programs are prohibited, the use and cost of media guides and recruiting brochures vary across different sports and institutions, especially where media exposure is limited. Such publications can be cost-effective and provide information to wide audiences.

Action: Moot in Division I; adopted by Division II (170-46).

NO. 40-3 RECRUITING MATERIALS

Intent: To permit an institution to provide a media guide to a prospect only in the sport for which the prospect is being recruited and to indicate that the publication may have only one color of printing inside the covers.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 40, 13.4, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"13.4 RECRUITING MATERIALS

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Printed Recruiting Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, game programs, newspaper clippings):

[13.4.1-(a) through 13.4.1-(c), unchanged.]

"(d) Publications (Athletics). A media guide may be provided to a prospect only in the sport for which the prospect is being recruited. The publication may have only one color of printing inside the covers."

[13.4.1-(d) through 13.4.1-(f), relettered as 13.4.1-(e) through 13.4.1-(g), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Rationale: Media guides include information that may be useful to prospects. The information contained in these guides may not be readily available in sports other than football and basketball; therefore, the Council believes it should be permissible to provide such publications to prospects, provided the one-color-of-print restriction is retained.

Action: Moot.

*NO. 41 (Dereg. 1) TELEPHONE CALLS — DIVISIONS I AND II FOOTBALL

Intent: In Divisions I and II football, to establish July 1 following a prospect's junior year in high school as the first date on which a

Legislative Proposals _____ A-75

prospect can be contacted by telephone, to permit institutions to telephone prospects at the institutions' discretion during the contact periods and to allow institutions to telephone prospects once per week during all other time periods.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.01.6, page 78, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA, and Division II football, divided vote, roll call]

"13.01.6 Time Periods for Contacts and Telephone Calls. In Divisions I and II, in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardians prior to July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school. Telephone calls shall not be made with a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) prior to August 15 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school in Divisions I-A and I-AA football and prior to July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school in all other Divisions I and II sports. In Division III, in-person, off-campus contacts with a prospect or a prospect's relatives or legal guardians may not be made until the prospect has completed the junior year in high school. In Divisions I and II football and basketball, such contacts are confined to specific contact periods. In all Divisions I and II sports, time periods are established during which no on- or off-campus contacts are permitted."

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.1.1, page 80, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA and Division II football, divided vote, roll call]

"13.1.1.1 High-School Prospects. In Divisions I and II, in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or guardian(s) prior to July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school. Telephone calls shall not be made with a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) prior to August 15 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school in Divisions I-A and I-AA football and prior to July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school in all other Divisions I and II sports. In Division III, in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or guardian(s) until the prospect has completed the junior year in high school. U.S. service academy exceptions to this provision are set forth in 13.17.1."

C. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.4-(b), pages 82-83, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA and Division II football, divided vote, roll call]

"(b) Telephone Contact. In Divisions I and II sports other than Divisions I-A and I-AA football, staff members shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) prior to July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school; thereafter, in sports other than Divisions I-A and I-AA and Division II football, staff mem-

bers shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) more than once per week but may accept collect calls from the prospect. In Divisions I-A and I-AA and Division II football, staff members shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) prior to August 15 following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school. Thereafter, from August 15 through November 30, telephone contact with a prospective student-athlete is limited to once per week outside of a contact period. From December 1 through February 15, in Divisions I-A and I-AA and Division II football, during a contact period, telephone contact may be made with a senior prospective student-athlete at the institution's discretion. Staff members may accept collect calls on or after July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school. From February 16 through August 14, Divisions I-A and I-AA football staff members shall not telephone a senior prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) more than once per week. In all sports, staff members in Divisions I and II shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) during the conduct of any of the institution's intercollegiate athletics contests in that sport.

"(1) Two-Year College Nonqualifier Exception. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, for a prospective student-athlete attending a two-year college who was not a qualifier, telephone contact is prohibited prior to August 15 following the prospect's completion of the first year of collegiate enrollment.

[13.1.2.4-(b)-(2) through 13.1.2.4-(b)-(6) renumbered as 13.1.2.4-(b)-(1) through 13.1.2.4-(b)-(5), unchanged.]

"(7) Off-Campus Contact Exception. Institutional staff members may make unlimited telephone calls to a prospective student-athlete on the day a permissible, in-person, off-campus contact occurs."

[Remainder of 13.1.2.4-(b) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: March 15, 1994.

Rationale: This proposal simplifies the legislation related to telephone contacts in Divisions I-A and I-AA and Division II football by eliminating the need for institutions and coaches to "track" two different calendars (e.g., one for telephone contacts and one for in-person, off-campus contacts). It establishes July 1 following a prospect's junior year in high school as the first date on which a prospect can be contacted by telephone, which is the current regulation for telephone contacts in all other Divisions I and II sports. Further, this proposal simplifies the recruiting process by permitting telephone calls to a prospect at the institution's discretion during the period in which in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts may occur, and once per week during all other time periods.

Action: Adopted by Division I-A (106-8), Division I-AA (118-0) and Division II (128-6).

NO. 42 (NO. 2-86) **MAXIMUM AWARDS — DIVISION I
MEN'S BASKETBALL**

Intent: To reinstate the grant-in-aid limitation of 14 in Division I men's basketball.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.4.1, page 184, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5.4.1 Men's Basketball — Division I. There shall be an annual limit of 14 during the 1992-93 academic year and 13 during the 1993-94 academic year and thereafter on the total number of counters in the sport of men's basketball at each Division I institution."

Source: Auburn University; Butler University; University of California, Santa Barbara; University of Evansville; George Washington University; Indiana State University; Indiana University, Bloomington; University of Michigan; Michigan State University; University of North Carolina, Wilmington; Ohio State University; University of Oklahoma; Pennsylvania State University; Purdue University; St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania); University of Tennessee at Chattanooga; and University of Wisconsin, Green Bay.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The reduction of scholarships from 15 to 13 has created a situation in which basketball programs have very little margin of error in recruiting prospects. A result of such reductions may be that the incidence of coaches "running off" scholarship student-athletes will increase. Further, such a scholarship reduction will adversely affect team preparation and practice activities. The additional scholarships contemplated by this proposal will serve to help offset situations where teams are depleted due to injuries, illness and transfer. Finally, this reduction has resulted in the loss of close to 600 scholarship opportunities for student-athletes.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Defeated by Division I (119-191, 17 abstentions).

NO. 43 (NO. 2-80) **SUMMER FINANCIAL AID**

Intent: To permit a Division I institution to award athletics aid to a student who is required to attend an institution's summer term prior to the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment if the student is required to attend the summer term as a condition of acceptance for enrollment in the fall, and to limit the recipient to not more than four additional summer terms of athletics aid.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.7.1.2, by adding new 15.2.7.1.2.1, page 173, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A, all other Division I members, divided vote, roll call]

"15.2.7.1.2.1 Academic-Enhancement Exception. The follow-

ing conditions apply to the awarding of athletics aid to a student-athlete to attend an institution in the summer prior to the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment:

"(a) The recipient shall be required to attend the summer term as a condition of acceptance for enrollment in the fall. Written verification shall be on file in the office of the director of admissions;

"(b) The recipient, if recruited, is subject to NCAA transfer provisions pursuant to 14.6.2-(h);

"(c) During the summer term or orientation period, the recipient shall not engage in any organized athletics practice activities (pursuant to 17.02.12);

"(d) The recipient shall be a qualifier in accordance with the requirements of 14.3;

"(e) The recipient shall be enrolled in not less than five credit hours; and

"(f) The recipient shall be limited to not more than four additional summer terms of athletics aid."

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Clemson University; University of Florida; Florida State University; University of Houston; University of Kentucky; Memphis State University; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; and Ohio State University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal is intended to help students overcome academic deficiencies in order to increase their chance of success in the classroom. Often, these students lack the resources to attend the summer term prior to their initial enrollment. This proposal will allow an institution to award athletics aid to those students who are required to attend the summer term as a condition of acceptance for enrollment in the fall. It contains adequate safeguards to eliminate any and all possible abuses. In addition, the proposal includes a provision that restricts summer term aid to avoid increased costs to the institution. Finally, this proposal should help increase the graduation rates of "at-risk students."

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee voted to oppose this proposal, inasmuch as it only permits institutions to award athletics aid to marginal students and does not provide the same opportunity for other students wishing to take summer school courses prior to initial full-time enrollment. Further, the committee believes that sufficient legislation exists that provides all prospective student-athletes who have financial need an opportunity to obtain institutional financial aid to attend summer school prior to initial full-time enrollment.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A (34-73, five abstentions); not moved in Division I.

***NO. 44 (NO. 2-120) DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL — PRESEASON SQUAD LIMIT**

Intent: To specify that a maximum of 105 student-athletes may participate in Division I-A preseason football practice.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.2.1 by adding new 17.7.2.1.1, page 242, as follows:

[Division I-A football only, roll call]

"17.7.2.1.1 Limit on Number of Participants — Division I-A. In Division I-A football, there shall be a limit of 105 student-athletes who may engage in practice activities prior to the institution's first day of classes or the institution's first contest, whichever occurs earlier."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee); NCAA Presidents Commission; University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Brigham Young University; University of Cincinnati; Colorado State University; East Carolina University; University of Georgia; University of Houston; Memphis State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Pittsburgh; Rice University; Syracuse University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin; Texas Christian University; West Virginia University, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal is offered as a cost-cutting measure. Limiting the number of preseason practice participants will preclude Division I-A institutions from providing preseason room and board expenses to more than 105 student-athletes in the sport of football.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The committee recommended that the Council cosponsor this proposal, which subsequently occurred.

Action: Adopted by Division I-A (97-11).

***NO. 45 (NO. 2-121) DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL — PRESEASON SQUAD LIMIT**

Intent: To specify that a maximum of 90 student-athletes may participate in Division I-AA preseason football practice.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.2.1 by adding new 17.7.2.1.1, page 242, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only, roll call]

"17.7.2.1.1 Limit on Number of Participants — Division I-AA. In Division I-AA football, there shall be a limit of 90 student-athletes who may engage in practice activities prior to the institution's first day of classes or the institution's first contest, whichever occurs earlier."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

A-80 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal is offered as a cost-cutting measure. Limiting the number of preseason practice participants will preclude Division I-AA institutions from providing preseason room and board expenses to more than 90 student-athletes in the sport of football.

Action: Adopted as amended by 45-2 and 45-3 by Division I-AA (92-22, five abstentions).

NO. 45-1 DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL — PRESEASON SQUAD LIMIT

Intent: To exempt Division I-AA programs that do not provide athletics aid in the sport of football from preseason squad limits.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 45, 17.7.2.1.1, by adding new 17.7.2.1.1.1, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only, roll call]

"17.7.2.1.1.1 Exception — Programs That Do Not Provide Athletics Aid. Division I-AA football programs that meet the following criteria are exempt from the preseason squad limit:

"(a) In the sport of football, the institution awards financial aid only to student-athletes who demonstrate financial need, except that loans, academic honor awards, nonathletics achievement awards, or on-campus employment and certain aid from outside sources may be provided without regard to financial need;

"(b) The institution uses a system for analyzing need that conforms to a uniform methodology approved by the U.S. Department of Education, and

"(c) The composition of the financial aid package offered to football student-athletes is consistent with the policy established for offering financial assistance to all students. The financial aid packages for football student-athletes also shall meet the following criteria:

"(1) The institution shall not consider athletics ability as a criterion in the formulation of any football student-athlete's financial aid package, and

"(2) The procedures used to award financial aid to football student-athletes must be the same as the existing financial aid procedures utilized for all students at the institution."

Source: Butler University, Canisius College, Duquesne University, University of Evansville, Georgetown University, Iona College, Marist College, St. John's University (New York), St. Peter's College and Siena College.

Effective Date: Immediately; for institutions reclassified as members of Division I-AA on September 1, 1993, as a result of the implementation of legislation to eliminate mul-

Legislative Proposals _____ A-81

tidivision classification or were first established and classified in Division I-AA as of September 1, 1993, or September 1, 1994.

Rationale: Most institutions that are playing Division I-AA football because of the elimination of multidivision classification are private institutions that provide nonscholarship football as an opportunity for students to participate in intercollegiate athletics and as an admissions tool for enrollment purposes. Limits on preseason football practices are contrary to meeting both of these goals.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 45-2

**DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL —
PRESEASON SQUAD LIMIT**

Intent: To exempt Division I-AA institutions that sponsor junior varsity teams that compete in at least four contests from the limit on the number of players who may participate in preseason football practice.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 45, 17.7.2.1.1, by adding new 17.7.2.1.1.1, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only, roll call]

"17.7.2.1.1.1 Junior Varsity Exception. Institutions that sponsor junior varsity teams that compete in at least four intercollegiate contests are not subject to the limits of 17.7.2.1.1."

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Rationale: Junior varsity contests traditionally start very close to the beginning of the varsity season. For safety reasons, these students (most of whom are freshmen and/or nonrecruited) must be given adequate time to prepare for competition.

Action: Adopted by Division I-AA (93-18, six abstentions).

NO. 45-3

**DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL —
PRESEASON SQUAD LIMIT**

Intent: In Division I-AA football, to specify that a maximum of 110 student-athletes, including first-time participants, may participate in preseason football practice activities prior to the institution's first day of classes or the institution's first contest, provided the institution establishes its first preseason practice date based on 27 practice opportunities.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 45, 17.7.2.1.1, by adding new 17.7.2.1.1.1, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only, roll call]

"17.7.2.1.1.1 Exception — Limited Preseason Practice Opportunities. There shall be a limit of 110 student-athletes who may engage in such preseason practice activities at an institution that establishes its first preseason practice date based on 27 practice opportunities, per 17.02.13, (in-

A-82

1994 Convention Proceedings

cluding practice opportunities for first-time participants)."

Source: Butler University, Canisius College, Central Connecticut State University, Duquesne University, University of Evansville, Georgetown University, Iona College, Marist College, St. Francis College (Pennsylvania), St. John's University (New York), St. Peter's College, Siena College, Towson State University and Wagner College.

Rationale: Many Division I-AA football programs offer financial aid on the basis of financial need unrelated to athletics ability. The size of their football squads is enrollment-driven. Such institutions that establish their first preseason practice date based on 27 practice opportunities should be permitted to increase the number of preseason participants to 110.

Action: Adopted by Division I-AA (91-25, two abstentions).

***NO. 46 (NO. 2-122) PRESEASON FOOTBALL PRACTICE —
ORIENTATION PERIOD**

Intent: To reduce the orientation period for first-time participants in Divisions I-A and I-AA football from four days to two days.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.2.5, page 243, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"17.7.2.5 Orientation Period — First-Time Participants, Divisions I-A and I-AA. A member of Division I-A or I-AA may establish an orientation period to commence four two days prior to the start of preseason football practice for those student-athletes who are beginning their initial season of eligibility for football practice at the institution.

[17.7.2.5.1 unchanged.]

"17.7.2.5.2 Counting Sundays. A Sunday, or the day on which it is permissible under 17.7.8.4 to issue equipment and take squad pictures, shall not be counted in this four two-day period."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Reducing the orientation period from four to two days should result in a cost savings.

Action: Adopted by Division I-A (58-55, one abstention); motion to reconsider defeated (55-55, one abstention). Adopted by Division I-AA (99-15, one abstention).

**NO. 47 (NO. 2-112) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
BASKETBALL PRACTICE**

Intent: In Divisions I and II, to permit an institution to begin on-court preseason basketball practice sessions October 15.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-83

Bylaws: Amend 17.3.2.1, page 225, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"17.3.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to *November 1* **October 15**.

[17.3.2.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.3.2.1.2 Prohibited Activities. Prior to *November 1* **October 15**, members of the institution's coaching staff may not be involved with one or more team members at any location in any of the following activities:

[17.3.2.1.2-(a) through 17.3.2.1.2-(f) unchanged.]

"17.3.2.1.2.1 Exception. Team promotional activities (e.g., autograph sessions, fan picture sessions, meeting with fans) per 12.5.1 are permissible prior to *November 1* **October 15**, provided these promotional arrangements do not involve any of the practice activities prohibited under the provisions of 17.3.2.1.2."

Source: Augustana College (South Dakota), Mankato State University, Morehouse College, University of Nebraska at Kearney, North Dakota State University, Northern Kentucky University, Northern Michigan University, Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science, University of South Dakota, South Dakota State University and Texas A&M University, Kingsville.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Moving the starting date for on-court basketball practice to November 1, without a corresponding adjustment in the starting date for competition, is counterproductive to the needs of student-athletes. This shortened time period forces coaches to maximize practice time, which potentially places more physical and personal demands on the student-athletes. By compressing the on-court practice season, the academic welfare, health and safety of student-athletes is placed in jeopardy.

Committee Position (Divisions I, II and III Steering Committees): The Divisions I and II Steering Committees voted to support this proposal. The Division III Steering Committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division I (266-61, three abstentions) and Division II (158-54).

NO. 48 (NO. 2-113) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — BASKETBALL PRACTICE

Intent: To permit a Division I institution to begin on-court preseason basketball practice sessions one month prior to the Friday immediately following Thanksgiving.

Bylaws: Amend 17.3.2.1, page 225, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"17.3.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to **30 days before the Friday immediately following Thanksgiving in Division I and November 1 in Divisions II and III.**

[17.3.2.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.3.2.1.2 Prohibited Activities. Prior to **30 days before the Friday immediately following Thanksgiving in Division I and November 1 in Divisions II and III**, members of the institution's coaching staff may not be involved with one or more team members at any location in any of the following activities:

[17.3.2.1.2-(a) through 17.3.2.1.2-(f) unchanged.]

"17.3.2.1.2.1 Exception. Team promotional activities (e.g., autograph sessions, fan picture sessions, meeting with fans) per 12.5.1 are permissible prior to **30 days before the Friday immediately following Thanksgiving in Division I and November 1 in Divisions II and III**, provided these promotional arrangements do not involve any of the practice activities prohibited under the provisions of 17.3.2.1.2."

Source: All members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately

Rationale: This proposal defines the permissible starting date for Division I basketball practice consistent with the original intent of legislation adopted in January of 1990; namely, to allow one month of practice prior to the start of the playing season. Since then, the date of the first contest has been moved one week earlier. Thus, it is appropriate that the start of practice also be moved one week earlier. The intent of this proposal is not to seek additional practice days, but is to reinstate legislation permitting one month of on-court preseason basketball practice.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The committee voted to support this proposal but noted its preference for Proposal No. 47 (2-112).

Action: Moot.

NO. 49 (NO. 2-114) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — BASKETBALL PRACTICE

Intent: To permit an institution to begin on-court preseason basketball practice sessions on the fourth Monday prior to the first permissible contest date, and to permit team conditioning activities in Division III to begin October 15.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.2.1, page 225, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"17.3.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to *November 1* **the fourth Monday preceding the first permissi-**

ble contest date per 17.3.3-(a) and 17.3.3-(b).

[17.3.2.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.3.2.1.2 Prohibited Activities. Prior to *November 1* the fourth Monday preceding the first permissible contest date per 17.3.3-(a) and 17.3.3-(b), members of the institution's coaching staff may not be involved with one or more team members at any location in any of the following activities:

[17.3.2.1.2-(a) through 17.3.2.1.2-(f) unchanged.]

"17.3.2.1.2.1 Exception. Team promotional activities (e.g., autograph sessions, fan picture sessions, meeting with fans) per 12.5.1 are permissible prior to *November 1* the fourth Monday preceding the first permissible contest date per 17.3.3-(a) and 17.3.3-(b), provided these promotional arrangements do not involve any of the practice activities prohibited under the provisions of 17.3.2.1.2."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.2.1.1, page 225, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.3.2.1.1 Permissible Conditioning Activities. Team conditioning or physical fitness activities supervised by coaching staff members may be conducted on or off court but shall not begin prior to *October 1* **October 15** in Division III or prior to the beginning of the institution's academic year in accordance with 17.1.5.2 in Divisions I and II."

Source: Babson College; Beloit College; California Lutheran University; University of Dubuque; Emory and Henry College; Ferrum College; Fonthonne College; Franklin College; Goucher College; Grove City College; Hanover College; Illinois Benedictine College; Jersey City State College; Keuka College; St. Joseph's College (Maine); Virginia Wesleyan University; Whittier College; University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire; University of Wisconsin, Platteville, and nine other member institutions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The November 1 starting date for on-court basketball practice has produced increased pressures on student-athletes and coaches. Compacting practice time has led to increased physical demands and much consternation on the part of coaches and athletes alike. When 15 of the possible 32 practice days were cut from the October 15 start date in 1992, preparation time drastically suffered, forcing coaches to maximize each available day of preseason practice. Division III men's and women's basketball is unique from the other divisions in that an extensive team tryout process is involved, which further erodes necessary preseason preparation time. In a survey of Division III members of the National Association of Basketball Coaches (responded to by 207 of 289 coaches), overwhelming sentiment was expressed that there was not enough time to prepare teams

adequately (88 percent) and that this was the single biggest concern in Division III men's basketball (71 percent). Division III members of the Women's Basketball Coaches Association have discussed similar concerns. Future calendars make this an even more untenable practice preparation situation under the present rules: 1993 — 16 practice days, 1994 — 15, 1995 — 14, 1996 — 18, 1997 — 17. Linking the start of the preseason practice period to the first contest date, while reducing the conditioning period by 15 days, allows for consistent planning of 21 practice days around the required day off per week.

Committee Position (Divisions I, II and III Steering Committees): The Division I Steering Committee expressed its support for this proposal but noted its preference for Proposal No. 47 (2-112). The Division II Steering Committee took no action on this proposal. The Division III Steering Committee expressed concern regarding the length of the proposed preseason practice period, and recommended that the sponsors of the proposal consider a more moderate change in the first practice date, which subsequently occurred. In addition, the committee noted its general support of the establishment of October 15, rather than October 1, as the beginning of the permissible period for conditioning activities.

Action: Part A moot in Divisions I and II. Part B adopted by Division III (217-58, one abstention).

NO. 50 (NO. 2-107) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — DIVISIONS I AND II BASEBALL

Intent: In Divisions I and II baseball, to increase an institution's declared playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) from 22 weeks to 24 weeks.

Bylaws: Amend 17.2.1, page 221, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"17.2.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) in baseball shall be limited to the following:

"(a) Divisions I and II — A maximum of 22 24 weeks."

[Remainder of 17.2.1 unchanged.]

Source: Arkansas State University; Auburn University; Brigham Young University; California State University, Fresno; Grand Canyon University; Indiana State University; Louisiana State University; Mississippi State University; University of Texas at Austin; Texas A&M University; Ohio State University; Washington State University, and Wichita State University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current limit of 22 weeks per year for baseball is incongruous with the intent of NCAA legislation to establish a level playing field (Constitution 2.8 — the principle of competitive

equity). Baseball is absolutely subject to weather conditions. Because weather cannot be legislated, this 22-week restriction decreases the opportunities of northern colleges by denying them the opportunity to maximize outdoor workouts and evaluations, particularly related to walk-ons. Further, such a limit discourages potential student-athletes, and professional baseball becomes all the more appealing. Finally, there has been no evidence that 24 weeks of baseball has restricted any student-athlete's academic progress or created significant additional expenses.

Committee Position (Divisions I and II Steering Committees): The committees voted to oppose this proposal.

Action: Defeated by Division I (45-268, 12 abstentions) and Division II (50-149, nine abstentions).

NO. 51 (NO. 2-109) CONTEST LIMITATIONS — DIVISION III BASEBALL

Intent: To permit a Division III institution to determine the distribution of baseball games to be played in the traditional and non-traditional segments, not to exceed the current overall limitation of 45 contests.

Bylaws: Amend 17.2.5.1, page 221, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.2.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of baseball during the institution's baseball playing season to the following number of contests (games and scrimmages), except for those contests excluded under 17.2.5.3:

[17.2.5.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III — 45 (with not more than 36 during the traditional segment)."

[Remainder of 17.2.5.1 unchanged.]

Source: California Lutheran University, Eastern Connecticut State University, Hanover College, Marietta College, Methodist College, Montclair State College, North Carolina Wesleyan College, Ohio Wesleyan University, St. Olaf College, Simpson College, University of Southern Maine, Southwestern University (Texas), Upper Iowa University, William Paterson College and College of Wooster.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The limitation on the number of games in which Division III baseball programs can participate in the traditional segment conflicts with the Division III Philosophy Statement. This statement stipulates that the NCAA's purpose in Division III matters is to assist in ways "that minimize infringement on the freedom of individual institutions to determine their own special objectives and programs." To permit Division III institutions to determine the number of allowable games in the traditional and non-traditional segments would appropriately reflect this ideal. This change would create absolutely no extra expenses for Division III institutions.

Committee Position (Division III Steering Committee): The committee voted to oppose this proposal.

Action: Defeated by Division III (64-191, 13 abstentions).

***NO. 52**

RESOLUTION: THE STUDENT-ATHLETE: WELFARE, ACCESS AND EQUITY

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, a basic principle of the NCAA, as set forth in its constitution, is that intercollegiate athletics programs shall be conducted in a manner designed to protect and enhance the physical and educational welfare of student-athletes; and

"Whereas, many of the legislative actions supported by the NCAA Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council in recent years have attempted to promote the welfare of student-athletes by enhancing their academic preparation, including their right to make normal progress toward a college degree; by reducing the athletically related time demands placed on them, and by affording them an opportunity to enjoy a collegiate experience in the same manner as other students; and

"Whereas, other entities in the NCAA structure are charged with consideration of additional matters affecting student-athlete welfare, such as gender and racial equity; physical safety, health and well-being, and appropriate opportunities for financial aid; and

"Whereas, the 1993 Convention approved a resolution directing a study of all welfare, access and equity issues that affect student-athletes, with that study to be concluded not later than June 1994 in order that any appropriate legislation might be presented to the 1995 NCAA Convention; and

"Whereas, the Presidents Commission and the Council appointed a Special Committee to Review Student-Athlete Welfare, Access and Equity to conduct the study as specified in the 1993 Convention resolution;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Presidents Commission and the Council be directed to consider the recommendations of the special committee in their respective summer meetings in 1994 and to submit appropriate legislation, if any, and other recommended actions to the 1995 Convention."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Subcommittee on Strategic Planning).

Action: Adopted (792-2).

***NO. 53**

RESOLUTION: INTEGRITY: SPORTSMANSHIP AND ETHICAL CONDUCT IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, a basic principle of the NCAA, as set forth in its con-

stitution, is that an institution's student-athletes and individuals employed by or otherwise associated with the institution shall deport themselves with honesty and good sportsmanship, and their behavior at all times is expected to reflect the high standards of honor and dignity that characterize participation in competitive sports in the collegiate setting; and

"Whereas, an entire article in the NCAA bylaws is devoted to ethical conduct, including the principle that intercollegiate athletics and the institutions and individuals involved therein shall represent the honor and dignity of fair play and the generally recognized high standards associated with wholesome competitive sports; and

"Whereas, the NCAA Presidents Commission has expressed concerns in recent years regarding such matters as improper language and other behavior by some student-athletes and institutional staff members, including fighting at intercollegiate athletics events;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Presidents Commission, in consultation with the Council and other constituencies, be directed to conduct a study of all relevant issues involving sportsmanship and ethical conduct in intercollegiate athletics, and to conclude the study not later than June 1995 in order that appropriate legislation, if any, and other recommended actions might be presented to the 1996 NCAA Convention."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Subcommittee on Strategic Planning).

Action: Adopted (759-1).

Personnel

NO. 54 (NO. 2-16) MARKETING STUDENT-ATHLETE TO PROFESSIONAL TEAMS

Intent: To permit an institution's professional sports counseling panel or head coach to contact agents, professional sports teams or professional sports organizations on behalf of student-athletes.

A. Bylaws: Amend 11.1.5, page 50, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"11.1.5 Marketing Student-Athletes to Professional Teams/Organizations. Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution shall not represent, directly or indirectly, any individual in the marketing of athletics ability or reputation to an agent, a professional sports team or a professional sports organization, **except as specified in 11.1.5.1**, and shall not receive compensation or gratuities of any kind, directly or indirectly, for such services.

"11.1.5.1 Exception -- Professional Sports Counseling Panel and Head Coach. An institution's professional sports counseling panel or a head coach in a sport

may contact agents, professional sports teams or professional sports organizations on behalf of a student-athlete, provided no compensation is received for such services. The head coach shall consult with and report his or her activities on behalf of the student-athlete to the institution's professional sports counseling panel. If the institution has no such panel, the head coach shall consult with and report his or her activities to the chief executive officer, [or an individual or group (e.g., athletics advisory board) designated by the chief executive officer]. The professional sports counseling panel and the head coach may:

"(a) Communicate directly (e.g., in-person, by mail or telephone) with representatives of a professional athletics team to assist in securing a tryout with that team for a student-athlete;

"(b) Assist the student-athlete in the selection of an agent by participating with the student-athlete in interviews of agents, by reviewing written information player agents send to the student-athlete and by having direct communication with those individuals who can comment about the abilities of an agent (e.g., other agents, a professional league's players' association), and

"(c) Visit with player agents or representatives of professional athletics teams to assist the student-athlete in determining his or her market value (e.g., potential salary, draft status)."

B. Bylaws: Amend 12.3.4, page 68, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.3.4 Professional Sports Counseling Panel. It is permissible for an authorized professional sports counseling panel to:

[12.3.4-(a) through 12.3.4-(d), unchanged.]

"(e) Communicate directly (e.g., in-person, by mail or telephone) with representatives of a professional athletics team to assist in securing a tryout with that team for a student-athlete;

"(f) Assist the student-athlete in the selection of an agent by participating with the student-athlete in interviews of agents, by reviewing written information player agents send to the student-athlete and by having direct communication with those individuals who can comment about the abilities of an agent (e.g., other agents, a professional league's players' association), and

"(g) Visit with player agents or representatives of professional athletics teams to assist the student-athlete in determining his or her market value (e.g., potential salary, draft status)."

[Remainder of 12.3.4 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Surveys of Division I football and basketball coaches indicated that 88 percent of football coaches and 97 percent of basketball coaches favor this concept. Student-athletes by nature seek out coaches for assistance with these matters, and if coaches are not allowed to assist in protecting student-athletes in working with agents and receiving tryouts, the Professional Sports Liaison Committee believes that other third parties (including unscrupulous agents) will begin to exert more and more influence over student-athletes. The committee believes that the overriding concern should be to protect the interests of student-athletes by providing them with a reliable source of advice. The proposal contains the safeguard that head coaches who engage in these activities must consult with and report to the institution's professional sports counseling panel or the institution's chief executive officer if there is no such panel.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 55 (NO. 2-24) GRADUATE ASSISTANT COACH —
DIVISION I-A**

Intent: To permit an institution to employ an additional graduate assistant coach in Division I-A football, provided at least one of the three graduate assistant coaches is an ethnic minority.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.2.1 by adding new 11.7.2.1.4, page 56, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"11.7.2.1.4 Additional Graduate Assistant Coach — Ethnic Minority. The institution may employ an additional graduate assistant coach, provided at least one of the three graduate assistant coaches is an ethnic minority."

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; University of Cincinnati; University of Florida; University of Georgia; University of Hawaii; University of Houston; Memphis State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; University of Pittsburgh; University of South Carolina, Columbia; University of Texas at Austin; Texas Tech University; West Virginia University, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will encourage and provide additional coaching opportunities for ethnic minorities in Division I-A football.

Committee Position (Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee): The committee agreed with the concept of encouraging and providing opportunities for ethnic minorities at all levels of participation in athletics. However, the committee did not support

this legislation as written. The committee believes that the legislation contains some ambiguity. For example, if an institution already has a minority graduate assistant, that institution will not be bound by this legislation to hire another minority to fill the third position. Therefore, enhancement is not achieved. As an alternative, the committee recommended that the sponsors consider legislation that would require one of the two current graduate assistant positions be designated for a ethnic minority.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A.

NO. 56 (NO. 2-14) VOLUNTEER COACH

Intent: In sports other than football and basketball, to permit an institution to pay expenses for the volunteer coach to travel with the team, engage in coaching activities at away-from-home contests, and receive two complimentary tickets to home athletics contests in all sports

Bylaws: Amend 11.02.6, page 49, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.02.6 Coach. Volunteer. In sports other than football and basketball, a volunteer coach is any coach who does not receive compensation or remuneration from the institution's athletics department or any organization funded in whole or in part by the athletics department or that is involved primarily in the promotion of the institution's athletics program (e.g., booster club, athletics foundation association). The following provisions shall apply:

"(a) The individual is prohibited from contacting and evaluating prospective student-athletes off campus, from performing coaching duties at an away-from-home contest or from scouting opponents off campus.

[11.02.6-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) The individual may receive a maximum of two complimentary tickets to home athletics contests in the coach's sport all sports.

[11.02.6-(d) unchanged.]

"11.02.6.1 Travel Expenses — Sports Other Than Football and Basketball. A volunteer coach may receive transportation to and from, and room and board, at away games."

Source: All members of the Patriot League; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; University of Oklahoma; Pennsylvania State University; Purdue University; University of Southern Mississippi; University of Texas at Austin, and University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This legislation will allow volunteer coaches to assume more fully actual coaching roles and to receive meaningful com-

plimentary tickets. It is a detriment to student-athletes to have a coach who can only coach them at home athletics contests. It is equally unfair to that coach who is only allowed to teach and coach at home events. Each institution, in most cases, has the discretion to determine its travel parties for away-from-home contests. Within that discretion, the institution should have the latitude to allow the volunteer coach to attend away-from-home contests if the institution deems it appropriate. In addition, the receipt of complimentary tickets only in that coach's sport is in most cases of very little, if any, practical value. It is appropriate to allow volunteer coaches to receive two complimentary tickets in all sports sponsored by the institution.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The committee voted to oppose this proposal on the basis of the potential for increased cost to the institution. The committee suggested that the proposal be amended to ensure that costs to the institution would not be increased as a result of the proposal. For example, the committee expressed the opinion that it would be more comfortable with the proposal if it could be shown that adding a volunteer coach to the number of passengers on the team bus would not increase costs; however, the committee remains concerned about the increase in cost that would appear to inevitably result from providing meals and lodging to the volunteer coach. The committee also expressed concern about allowing a volunteer coach to receive complimentary tickets to home contests in all sports, as opposed to in the coach's sport.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 57 (NO. 2-15) VOLUNTEER COACH

Intent: In sports other than football and basketball, to permit an institution to pay expenses for the volunteer coach to travel with the team and engage in coaching activities at away-from-home contests.

Bylaws: Amend 11.02.6, page 49, as follows:
[Division I only]

"11.02.6 Coach, Volunteer. In sports other than football and basketball, a volunteer coach is any coach who does not receive compensation or remuneration from the institution's athletics department or any organization funded in whole or in part by the athletics department or that is involved primarily in the promotion of the institution's athletics program (e.g., booster club, athletics foundation association). The following provisions shall apply:

"(a) The individual is prohibited from contacting and evaluating prospective student-athletes off campus, *from performing coaching duties at an away-from-home contest* or from scouting opponents off campus.

[11.02.6-(b) through 11.02.6-(d) unchanged.]

"11.02.6.1 Travel Expenses — Sports Other Than Football and Basketball. A volunteer coach may receive transportation to and from, and room and board, at away games."

Source: All members of the Patriot League.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: A volunteer coach works with a certain group of student-athletes or on a particular athletics skill throughout the week. There does not seem to be any reason to preclude a volunteer coach from traveling with the team to an away-from-home contest or from coaching his or her student-athletes during that contest. Traveling with the team is often a burden, as opposed to a benefit, to the volunteer coach.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The committee voted to oppose this proposal on the basis of the potential for increased cost to the institution. The committee suggested that the proposal be amended to ensure that costs to the institution would not be increased as a result of the proposal. For example, the committee expressed the opinion that it would be more comfortable with the proposal if it could be shown that adding a volunteer coach to the number of passengers on the team bus would not increase costs; however, the committee remains concerned about the increase in cost that would appear to inevitably result from providing meals and lodging to the volunteer coach. The committee also expressed concern about allowing a volunteer coach to receive complimentary tickets to home contests in all sports, as opposed to in the coach's sport.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 58 (NO. 2-18) NONINSTITUTIONAL PUBLICATIONS

Intent: To permit athletics department staff members to write educational articles related to NCAA rules and crowd control for noninstitutional publications dedicated to reporting on an institution's athletics activities.

Bylaws: Amend 11.3.2.7, page 51, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"11.3.2.7 Noninstitutional Publications That Report on Athletics Program. Athletics department staff members shall not endorse (either orally or in writing) any noninstitutional publication dedicated solely to reporting on an institution's athletics activities and, **except as provided in this section**, shall not write for or receive any remuneration from such publications.

"11.3.2.7.1 Educational Articles. Athletics department staff members may write educational articles related to NCAA rules and crowd control for noninstitutional publications dedicated primarily to reporting on an institution's athletics activities."

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Noninstitutional publications that are dedicated primarily to reporting on an institution's athletics activities target individuals who have an interest in or are involved in intercollegiate athletics. It is important that athletics department staff members be able to write articles for such publications related to NCAA regulations in order to educate individuals about the application of NCAA legislation to situations in which they might become involved. It also is important to make these individuals aware of issues related to crowd control, and athletics department staff members may be in the best position to write articles related to this issue as well.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

NO. 59 (NO. 2-19) SCOUTING OF OPPONENTS

Intent: To preclude the scouting of opponents in Division II, except for contests that are part of a tournament in which the institution is a participant and the exchange of film/videotape for scouting purposes.

Bylaws: Amend 11.6.1, page 54, as follows:

[Division II only]

"11.6.1 Division II. There *are* **shall be** no *restrictions on* scouting of opponents *by institutions* in Division II, **except as provided in this section.**

"11.6.1.1 Regular Season or Postseason Tournaments. It shall be permissible for coaching staff members to observe all contests that are part of a tournament in which the institution also is competing at that site.

"11.6.1.2 Cost of Exchanging Films/Videotapes. It shall be permissible to pay the costs of exchanging films/videotapes for scouting purposes, including the expenses of an individual traveling to pick up game films/videotapes."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Division II institutions can reduce expenditures in their intercollegiate athletics programs by prohibiting the off-campus, in-person scouting of opponents. It is anticipated that institutions will scout opponents by reviewing game tapes.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 60 (NO. 2-21) SCOUTING OF OPPONENTS — DIVISION I

Intent: To specify that when an individual is being reimbursed to

travel by automobile to scout an opponent, others who travel with that individual in the same vehicle to the site are not considered to be receiving transportation expenses.

Bylaws: Amend 11.6.2.1, pages 54-55, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.6.2.1 Basketball, Football, Lacrosse and Women's Volleyball. In basketball, football, lacrosse and women's volleyball, it shall be permissible for the institution to pay the expenses of one person to scout each opponent on one occasion. **When an individual is being reimbursed to travel by automobile to scout an opponent, others who travel with that individual in the same vehicle to the site are not considered to be receiving transportation expenses.** Any coach can scout opponents at his or her own expense except in Division I football and Division I basketball, where volunteer or undergraduate student coaches may not scout opponents, regardless of whether they are compensated for such scouting (see 11.7.1.1.1.1)."

[Remainder of 11.6.2.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The fact that an individual is traveling to scout an opponent and receives expenses from an institution for doing so should not preclude other individuals from riding in the same vehicle, inasmuch as the institution is not incurring any additional transportation costs.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 61 (NO. 2-154) RESOLUTION: COMPENSATION FOR ATHLETICS DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

[Division I only]

"Whereas, the NCAA Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics recognizes that philosophical questions arise when a coach receives total compensation far in excess of that received by any institutional faculty or staff member, including the chief executive officer, such as whether that is an indication that the intercollegiate athletics program is out of balance with the educational goals of the institution; and

"Whereas, the special committee does not believe it is appropriate for there to be NCAA legislation regulating the amount of compensation that institutional athletics department staff members, including coaches, may receive; and

"Whereas, the special committee believes that the NCAA membership is concerned about a number of issues, including possible conflicts of interest, related to such compensation; and

"Whereas, the special committee believes that concern exists about whether certain arrangements between athletics department staff members and athletics equipment and apparel manufacturers comply with general institutional policy, and applicable state and local laws; and

"Whereas, the special committee believes questions exist about whether individual coaches may improperly benefit from property rights vested in the institution;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Athletics Certification Committee be encouraged to continue its development of means of addressing the issue of compensation received by athletics department personnel as part of the Division I athletics certification program; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Athletics Certification Committee include among the issues it considers a requirement that institutions in the peer-review certification program present evidence that they have addressed the issues of conflict of interest, property rights, procurement regulations and other similar issues related to the compensation of athletics department personnel, and have reviewed the consistent application of state laws and institutional policies for individuals, including athletics department staff members, who may enjoy economic gain from the use of institution's name or facilities."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Action: Withdrawn.

Eligibility

NO. 62 (NO. 2-3) DRUG-TESTING CONSENT FORM AND SQUAD LIST — NONRECRUITED STUDENT-ATHLETE

Intent: In Divisions I and II, to permit a nonrecruited student-athlete in sports other than football and track to participate in preseason practice activities prior to the team's first date of competition without signing the drug-testing consent form or being included on the squad list.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.2.4.6.1 by adding new 3.2.4.6.1.1, page 10, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"3.2.4.6.1.1 Exception — Nonrecruited Student-Athlete. A nonrecruited student-athlete in sports other than football and track may participate in preseason practice activities prior to the team's first contest/date of competition without signing the drug-testing consent form."

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.1.4.1 by adding new 14.1 4.1.1, page 121, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.1.4.1.1 Exception — Nonrecruited Student-Athlete. A nonrecruited student-athlete in sports other than football and track may participate in preseason practice activities prior to the team's first contest/date of competition without signing the drug-testing consent form."

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Mid-American Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to reduce the administrative burden that is created as a result of nonrecruited student-athletes who practice for a limited time and subsequently quit or never make the team. Permitting nonrecruited student-athletes to participate in preseason practice activities prior to the first date of competition without having to sign the drug-testing consent form or be included on the squad-list form, not only provides limited deregulation, but also should increase the accuracy of the participation numbers in each sport as reflected on the squad list. Currently, squad-list numbers are regularly utilized for various purposes (e.g., participation ratios for gender-equity studies) with no regard to the length of time that each listed student-athlete actually spent on the team. Nonrecruited student-athletes in the sports of football and track will not qualify for this exception due to an existing mandate that all student-athletes in those sports remain accessible for drug testing throughout the school year.

Committee Position (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports): The committee voted to support this proposal. The committee noted that any sport involved in the Association's year-round drug-testing program must have drug-testing consent forms and squad lists with all athletes prior to any official practice. The proposed legislation is appropriate but the committee recommended using the phrase "any sport involved in the Association's year-round drug-testing program" rather than referencing specific sports to accommodate the future expansion of this program.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

NO. 63 (NO. 2-55) SEASON OF COMPETITION

Intent: To permit competition in a maximum of two approved two-year college scrimmages to be exempted annually from counting as a season of competition.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4.1, page 126 as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"14.2.4.1 Minimum Amount of Competition. Any competition

(including a scrimmage with outside competition, (except for approved two-year college scrimmages per 14.2.4.1.1)), regardless of time, during a season in an intercollegiate sport shall be counted as a season of competition in that sport. This provision is applicable to intercollegiate athletics competition conducted by a two-year or four-year collegiate institution at the varsity or subvarsity level.

14.2.4.1.1 Exception — Two-Year College Scrimmages. Participation in a two-year college scrimmage shall be exempt from counting as a season of competition, provided the competition meets all of the following conditions:

- “(a) The scrimmage is approved by the two-year college;
- “(b) No official score is kept;
- “(c) No admission is charged;
- “(d) No official time is kept;
- “(e) The scrimmage is played prior to the two-year college’s first regularly scheduled outside competition;
- “(f) The student-athlete participates in not more than two such scrimmages or dates of competition per academic year.”

Source: NCAA Council (Two-Year College Relations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Many two-year colleges conduct preseason scrimmages to evaluate walk-ons and complete rosters, and many two-year college athletics organizations do not count involvement in such scrimmages as a season of competition. Accordingly, there have been instances in which a student-athlete (who later participated at an NCAA institution) did not realize that he or she had utilized a season of competition by participating in a preseason scrimmage at the two-year institution. In some instances, this has caused NCAA member institutions to allow a student-athlete to participate in an impermissible fifth season of competition. This proposal will reduce an institution’s vulnerability to such an occurrence and protect student-athletes who may have participated in limited, informal scrimmages against outside competition at a two-year college.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I, II and III.

**NO. 64 (NO. 2-56) TWO-YEAR COLLEGE HARDSHIP
WAIVER — DIVISION I**

Intent: To permit a Division I student-athlete who entered a collegiate institution prior to August 1, 1992, to be granted a hardship waiver based on an injury or illness that occurred during enrollment at a two-year college, regardless of when the student-athlete first entered a collegiate institution.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.5.1, page 127, as follows:

[Division I only]

“14.2.5.1 Additional Division I Criteria — Two-Year College Hardship. Division I institutions shall apply the following additional conditions if the injury or illness occurred at a two-year college:

- “(a) The appropriate two-year college athletics association (e.g., National Junior College Athletic Association, Community College League of California) shall review and approve each hardship waiver request;
- “(b) Subsequent to approval by the appropriate two-year college athletics association, the request shall be reviewed and approved by the appropriate NCAA member conference or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Eligibility Committee, to ensure compliance with the provisions of NCAA legislation;
- “(c) Waiver requests shall be submitted only from two-year college organizations that apply the same or more stringent rules related to the administration of hardship waivers (i.e., compliance with all of the regulations of Bylaw 14.2.5), and
- “(d) Each waiver request must be accompanied by a signed statement by the physician who treated the student-athlete, indicating the reason(s) why the injury or illness was incapacitating.”

Source: NCAA Council (Two-Year College Relations Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1992, (for student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1992).

Rationale: The NCAA Administrative Review Panel has received several requests from Division I institutions to grant hardships for student-athletes who were injured at a two-year college, but who entered a collegiate institution before August 1, 1992. The panel has granted some of these requests (primarily due to misinformation given to the student-athlete) and denied others. Student-athletes in these situations should not be disqualified from consideration for hardship waivers merely because they enrolled in a collegiate institution before August 1, 1992. Safeguards built into the rule will continue to ensure that any hardship that is granted will meet strict review standards.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

**NO. 65 (NO. 2-57) INITIAL ELIGIBILITY — CORE-
CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To specify that the two years of mathematics required to fulfill the Division I core-curriculum requirements must consist of one year of algebra and one year of geometry or a higher-level mathematics course for which geometry is a prerequisite.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1, page 131, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.3.1.1 Division I. A qualifier in Division I is defined as one who is a high-school graduate and who presented the following academic qualifications:

"(a) A minimum cumulative grade-point average as specified in 14.3.1.1.1 (based on a maximum 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 13 academic courses per 14.3.1.3, including the following:

"Mathematics 2 years"

(one year of algebra and one year of geometry) (or one year of a higher-level mathematics course for which geometry is a prerequisite))

[Remainder of 14.3.1.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.3, pages 132-133, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.3.1.3 Core-Curriculum Requirements. For purposes of meeting the core-curriculum requirement to establish eligibility at a Division I or II member institution, a 'core course' is defined as a recognized academic course (as opposed to a vocational or personal-service course) that offers fundamental instructional components in a specified area of study. Courses that are taught at a level below the high school's regular academic instructional level (e.g., remedial, special education or compensatory) shall not be considered core courses regardless of course content. Effective with courses taken during the 1987-88 academic year and thereafter, at least 75 percent of the instructional content of a course must be in one or more of the required areas [as listed in (a) through (f) below], and 'statistics,' as referred to in the mathematics section, must be advanced (algebra-based). For courses taken during and prior to the 1986-87 academic year to be considered core courses, at least some instructional elements (as listed below) must be included.

[14.3.1.3-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Mathematics — [two years required, including in Division I at least one year of algebra and one year of geometry) **(or one year of a higher-level mathematics course for which geometry is a prerequisite)**]. Core courses in mathematics shall include instructional elements in algebra, geometry, trigonometry, statistics (algebra-based) or calculus."

[Remainder of 14.3.1.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering collegiate institutions on or after August 1, 1996.

Rationale: Pursuant to the adoption of 1993 Convention Proposal

No. 19, a prospective student-athlete who pursues a normal progression of high-school mathematics courses beyond geometry would be precluded from using grades earned in those courses to fulfill the mathematics component of the Association's core-curriculum requirements, even if the student achieved grades in the advanced mathematics courses that were superior to the grade earned in geometry. The Academic Requirements Committee does not believe that the Division I membership understood this legislative "quirk" when it adopted Proposal No. 19 in 1993, and does not believe it is appropriate to preclude students from using advanced mathematics courses to fulfill the Association's mathematics core-curriculum requirement, provided the students have completed a geometry core course. Members of the committee have reviewed the College Board study cited by the sponsors of 1993 Convention Proposal No. 19. The committee emphasizes that this proposal is consistent with the information contained in the study

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 66 (NO. 2-58) TWO-WEEK TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION PERIOD

Intent: To eliminate the two-week temporary certification period for practice for recruited student-athletes.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.5.1.1, page 137, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.3.5.1.1 Temporary Certification, Recruited Student-Athlete. If a recruited student-athlete reports for athletics participation before the high-school core-curriculum grade-point average and test score have been certified, the student may practice, but not compete, for a maximum of two weeks, provided the student is enrolled full time or has been accepted for enrollment as a regular full-time student. After this two-week period, the student shall have established minimum requirements as a qualifier to continue practicing or to compete."

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.6.4.4.6.1, page 148, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.6.4.4.6.1 Temporary Certification, Recruited Two-Year College Transfer. If a recruited two-year college transfer reports for athletics participation before the student's high-school or two-year college academic record has been certified, the student may practice, but not compete, for a maximum of two weeks. After this two-week period, the student shall have established minimum requirements as a transfer to continue practicing or to compete."

Source: NCAA Council (Divisions I and II Steering Committees).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Current legislation permits a recruited prospect to be certified to practice for a maximum of two weeks before the high-school core-curriculum grade-point average and test score

have been certified, but does not allow such a prospect to receive financial aid during this time period. The Council believes that the legislation related to practice and receipt of financial aid during this time period should be consistent, and also believes that allowing a recruited prospect to practice under these circumstances could be sending the wrong message regarding the importance of having the initial eligibility of a recruited prospect certified in a timely manner. The Council also believes that the establishment of the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse will greatly reduce the time period necessary to establish the initial eligibility of recruited prospective student-athletes.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 66-1

**TWO-WEEK TEMPORARY
CERTIFICATION PERIOD**

Intent: To delay until August 1, 1995, the effective date of the proposed elimination of the two-week temporary certification period for recruited student-athletes and recruited two-year college transfer students.

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

Effective Date: August 1, 1994 **August 1, 1995.**

Source: All members of the Southland Conference.

Rationale: Delaying the effective date will provide time to ensure that the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse operates consistent with institutional deadlines. It also is necessary to communicate with two-year colleges regarding the proposed elimination of the temporary certification period to encourage the timely provision of eligibility information

Action: Moot.

NO. 67 (NO. 2-53)

**FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT —
CORRESPONDENCE COURSES**

Intent: To preclude the use of correspondence courses for purposes of establishing full-time enrollment.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.6.2.6, page 123, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"14.1.6.2.6 *Correspondence or Extension Courses.* A student-athlete may use a combination of hours taken in residence during a regular term and *correspondence or extension* courses taken from the certifying institution during that term to meet the minimum 12-hour enrollment requirement, provided the institution considers enrollment in such *extension or correspondence* courses as regular course enrollment for all students during term time."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: This proposal will strengthen the Association's academic

standards by precluding the use of correspondence courses for purposes of establishing full-time enrollment. Correspondence courses are subject to abuse by individuals who wish to "major in athletics eligibility," and are less conducive to degree completion.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I, II and III.

NO. 68 (NO. 2-60)

**REGULAR ACADEMIC YEAR —
CORRESPONDENCE COURSES**

Intent: To preclude the use of correspondence courses to fulfill the requirement that at least 75 percent of a student-athlete's satisfactory-progress hours must be earned during the regular academic year.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.4.1, page 140, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.5.4.1 Regular Academic Year. The student-athlete shall earn at least 75 percent of the semester or quarter hours required for satisfactory progress during the regular academic year. The student-athlete shall earn no more than 25 percent of the semester or quarter hours required for satisfactory progress during the summer **or through correspondence courses taken during the 1993-94 academic year and thereafter.**"

[Remainder of 14.5.4.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal confirms an official interpretation that correspondence courses taken during the 1993-94 academic year and thereafter shall not count as "regular-academic-year" courses to fulfill the new "75/25" satisfactory-progress rule. It is based on concerns forwarded to the Academic Requirements Committee by various institutional and conference administrators regarding the potential use of correspondence courses to circumvent the legislative intent of that rule. It will not affect correspondence courses taken during 1992-93, inasmuch as a prior, permissive committee interpretation regarding the use of correspondence courses has been widely disseminated. In addition, it is important to note that this legislation will not affect the ability of student-athletes to use correspondence courses to fulfill the Association's other new satisfactory-progress requirements (i.e., Bylaws 14.5.2.1 ("25/50/75") and 14.5.3.1 ("90/95")).

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

NO. 69 (NO. 2-59)

**SATISFACTORY PROGRESS —
MIDYEAR CERTIFICATION OPTION**

Intent: To specify that if a student-athlete is ineligible pursuant to one or more of the "25/50/75," and "50" degree completion and "90/95" grade-point average satisfactory-progress provisions at the beginning of the fall term, eligibility may be reinstated at the

beginning of any other regular term of that academic year, provided the student subsequently has fulfilled the satisfactory-progress standard(s) in which the student formerly was deficient.

- A. **Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.2 by adding new 14.5.2.2, page 139, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.5.2.2 Certification at Beginning of Fall Term. A student-athlete's eligibility under this provision shall be determined on the basis of the student's academic record in existence at the beginning of the fall term of the regular academic year. If the student-athlete is ineligible under the provisions of the satisfactory-progress legislation at the beginning of the fall term, eligibility may be reinstated at the beginning of any other regular term of that academic year, based upon the student's subsequent fulfillment of the necessary degree requirements."

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.3 by adding new 14.5.3.2, page 140, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.5.3.2 Certification at Beginning of Fall Term. A student-athlete's eligibility under this provision shall be determined on the basis of the student's academic record in existence at the beginning of the fall term of the regular academic year. If the student-athlete is ineligible under the provisions of the satisfactory-progress legislation at the beginning of the fall term, eligibility may be reinstated at the beginning of any other regular term of that academic year, based upon the student's subsequent fulfillment of the minimum grade-point average requirement."

- C. **Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.4.4 by adding new 14.5.4.4.1, page 141, as follows.

[Division I only]

"14.5.4.4.1 Certification at Beginning of Fall Term. A student-athlete's eligibility under this provision shall be determined on the basis of the student's academic record in existence at the beginning of the fall term of the regular academic year. If the student-athlete is ineligible under the provisions of the satisfactory-progress legislation at the beginning of the fall term, eligibility may be reinstated at the beginning of any other regular term of that academic year, based upon the student's subsequent fulfillment of the necessary degree requirements."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: A significant amount of confusion appears to exist within the Division I membership regarding the upcoming implementation of the satisfactory-progress legislation related to the fulfill-

ment of minimum grade-point average and degree-program requirements. This proposal will permit institutions to implement these requirements in a sensible manner that will not compromise the basic intent of the new satisfactory-progress legislation. It will avoid the establishment of additional midterm eligibility standards that will further complicate the administration of this legislation. Students who use the midyear certification option still will be held accountable for satisfactory-progress requirements that apply at the beginning of the subsequent fall term.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 70 (NO. 2-62) SATISFACTORY PROGRESS — PART-TIME ENROLLMENT

Intent: To preclude the use of credit hours earned while enrolled as a part-time student to fulfill the "24-hour" and the "averaging method" satisfactory-progress requirements in Division I.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.4 by adding new 14.5.4.2, page 140, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.5.4.2 Part-Time Enrollment — Division I. Semester or quarter hours earned by a student-athlete while enrolled in less than a full-time program of studies (per 14.1.6.2.2) shall not be used to meet satisfactory-progress requirements of 14.5.4-(a) and 14.5.4-(b)."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994 (for credit hours earned during the 1994-95 academic year and thereafter).

Rationale: Currently, a "spring sport" student-athlete who does not fulfill satisfactory-progress requirements at the beginning of the fall term can enroll as a part-time student during the fall term and apply the credit hours earned during the fall term in meeting the "fall-to-fall" satisfactory-progress requirement. This proposal will ensure that student-athletes in spring-semester sports are treated in the same manner as those in fall sports in the administration of satisfactory-progress requirements. The adoption of this proposal also will cause hours earned as a part-time student to be treated in the same way as they currently are treated in administering the "missed term" exception under Bylaw 14.5.6-(a).

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 71 (NO. 2-148) ELIGIBILITY — FIVE-YEAR/10-SEMESTER RULE

Intent: To eliminate the requirement that a student-athlete must be unable to attend a collegiate institution (or, in Divisions II and III, to continue enrollment on a full-time basis) in order to be granted a waiver of the five-year/10-semester rule.

Bylaws: Amend 30.6.1, page 379, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"30.6.1 Waiver Criteria. A waiver of the five-year or 10-semester rule may be granted *only when circumstances clearly supported by based upon objective evidence establish that a student-athlete is unable to attend a collegiate institution (or, in Divisions II and III, to continue enrollment on a full-time basis) for reasons that are unrelated to athletics or to personal or family finances and that are beyond the control of either the student-athlete, or the institution* Under such circumstances, a student-athlete may qualify for an extension of eligibility in Division I only for a period equal to the amount of time between the date he or she becomes unable to attend a collegiate institution and the date of the start of the first regular term in which he or she is able to return. If the extension of the five-year rule is for a period of at least four months and permits the student-athlete to be eligible at the beginning of official institutional practice in the traditional segment or season in a sport, the student-athlete shall be permitted to participate for the entire traditional segment or season in that sport."

Source: NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Administrative Review Panel has recommended to the Council, and the Council has agreed, that the Eligibility Committee should be responsible for reviewing requests for extensions of the five-year/10-semester rule; however, because the Administrative Review Panel no longer will be considering these cases, it seems appropriate to broaden the Eligibility Committee's authority to grant such extensions.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I, II and III

**NO. 72 (NO. 2-63) ACADEMIC DEGREE
REQUIREMENTS — TWO-YEAR
COLLEGE TRANSFERS**

Intent: To specify that at least 25 percent of the credit hours used to fulfill the academic degree requirements of a two-year college transfer student must be earned at the two-year college that awards the degree.

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.4.4.1, page 148, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.6.4.4.1 Multiple Two-Year Colleges. When the student-athlete has been in residence at two or more two-year colleges, the terms of residence at all two-year colleges may be combined in order to satisfy the residence requirement. All grades and all course credits that are transferable from the two-year colleges to the member institution shall be considered in determining the student-athlete's eligibility under 14.6. **In addition, at least 25 percent of the credit hours used to fulfill the student's academic degree requirements must be earned at the**

two-year college that awards the degree per 14.6."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal results from concerns shared by both the Academic Requirements Committee and the NCAA Two-Year College Relations Committee regarding two-year college "degree mills" that will award an associate's degree to a student who has completed little or no course work in residence at that institution. It establishes an academic requirement that is comparable to the one academic year in residence that four-year collegiate institutions traditionally require in order to confer a bachelor's degree. This requirement will apply both to "2-4" and "4-2-4" transfer students.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

**NO. 73 (NO. 2-64) ELIGIBILITY — TWO-YEAR COLLEGE
TRANSFER**

Intent: To permit a two-year college transfer student who participated in a maximum of two regularly scheduled scrimmages while enrolled at the two-year college to participate in regular-season or NCAA championship competition in that sport during the same academic year, upon transfer to a Division I or II institution.

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.4.4.7, page 149, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.6.4.4.7. Competition in Year of Transfer. A transfer student from a two-year college is not eligible for regular-season or NCAA championship competition in a sport if the student-athlete has competed at the two-year college in **any competition other than regularly scheduled scrimmages** in that sport during the same academic year. **Such scrimmages must meet the following criteria:**

"(a) **The scrimmage is approved by the two-year college;**

"(b) **No official score is kept;**

"(c) **No admission is charged;**

"(d) **No official time is kept;**

"(e) **The scrimmage is played prior to the two-year college's first regularly scheduled outside competition;**

"(f) **The student-athlete participates in not more than two such scrimmages or dates of competition per academic year."**

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Under current legislation, a student-athlete who transfers from a four-year institution during the academic year could represent both four-year institutions against outside competition

during the same academic year, provided the student-athlete meets an exception to the transfer residence requirement. It seems equitable to allow a two-year college transfer student the same opportunity if he or she has only participated in regularly scheduled scrimmages at the two-year college.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

**NO. 74 (NO. 2-66) ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION —
DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL**

Intent: In the sport of football, to permit a student-athlete to utilize the one-time transfer exception when transferring from Division I-AA to Division I-A.

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.5.3.10, page 151, as follows:
[Division I-A football only]

"14.6.5.3.10 One-Time Transfer Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year collegiate institution and all of the following conditions are met:

"(a) The student is a participant in a sport other than Division I basketball. *Division I-A football or Division I men's ice hockey.* A participant in Division I-AA football must have transferred to the certifying institution from an institution that sponsors Division I-A football. **A participant in Division I-A football must have transferred to the certifying institution from an institution that sponsors Division I-AA football;**"

[Remainder of 14.6.5.3.10 unchanged.]

Source: Auburn University, Brigham Young University, East Carolina University, Kansas State University, Louisiana State University, Texas Christian University, Texas Tech University, University of Texas at Austin, West Virginia University and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Current NCAA legislation permits a student participating in the sport of football to utilize the provisions of the one-time transfer exception when transferring from a Division I-A or I-AA institution to an institution sponsoring the sport of football in Divisions II or III. Football student-athletes also are permitted to use the one-time transfer exception when transferring from a Division I-A institution to a Division I-AA institution. This proposal will establish a similar exception for a student transferring from a Division I-AA institution to a Division I-A institution.

Committee Position (Eligibility Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division I-A.

**NO. 75 (NO. 2-67) ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION —
DIVISION II**

Intent: To prohibit a Division II student-athlete who is utilizing the one-time transfer exception from competing at two four-year institutions during the same academic year in the sport of basketball.

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.5.3.10, page 151, as follows:
[Division II only]

"14.6.5.3.10 One-Time Transfer Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year collegiate institution and all of the following conditions are met:

[14.6.5.3.10-(a) through 14.6.5.3.10-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) **In Division II basketball, the student-athlete must not have competed in the sport of basketball at the previous four-year institution during the same academic year, and**"

[14.6.5.3.10-(e), relettered as 14.6.5.3.10-(f), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee) and all members of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The one-time transfer exception is generally sound legislation, but it should be modified to preclude a four-year college transfer student from competing at two institutions in the sport of basketball during the same academic year. Bylaw 14.6.4.4.7, which prohibits two-year college transfers from competing at the four-year school to which they transfer if they participated during the fall semester, addresses most of these situations. There is still a loophole that allows some four-year college transfers to transfer and play basketball at two four-year institutions in the same academic year. Many of these transfers involve fourth- and fifth-year Division I student-athletes transferring to a lower division, which may have adverse academic consequences for the student-athlete, such as loss of credits upon transfer. These transfer students also can have a major impact on conference and national competition. Further, the addition of midyear transfers may stimulate the need to "rescort" an opponent during the second semester. It is in the best interests of the student-athlete, the affected institutions, and Division II championship competition to allow the one-time transfer exception for four-year college transfers in the sport of basketball to be effective only with the beginning of the next basketball season.

Committee Position (Eligibility Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division II.

NO. 76 (NO. 2-68) OUTSIDE COMPETITION — DIVISION I

Intent: In Division I, to permit a student-athlete in sports other

than basketball to participate as a member of an outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition during official vacation periods published in the institution's catalog, provided such participation occurs outside of the student-athlete's playing and practice season. [Note: Part B of the following proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

- A. **Bylaws:** Amend 14.8.1, page 152, by adding new 14.8.1.1.1, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.8.1 Outside Competition, Sports Other Than Basketball

[14.8.1.1 unchanged]

"14.8.1.1.1 Exception. A student-athlete may compete outside of the institution's declared playing and practice season as a member of an outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition during any official vacation period published in the institution's catalog. The number of student-athletes from any one institution shall not exceed the applicable limits set forth in 17.23.2."

[Remainder of 14.8.1 unchanged.]

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.3 through 17.21, pages 230-304, for each sport except basketball by amending the respective sections entitled "Division I — During Academic Year," as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.8.1.1 Vacation-Period Exception. A student-athlete may compete outside of the institution's declared playing and practice season as a member of an outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition during any official vacation period published in the institution's catalog. The number of student-athletes from any one institution shall not exceed the applicable limits set forth in 17.23.2."

Source: All members of the Atlantic Coast Conference, University of Cincinnati, University of Connecticut, Quincy University and St. Mary's College (California).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The intent of the original legislation was to reduce time demands on student-athletes and expense to the institution. During an institution's semester break and vacation periods, participation in outside competition would have no negative impact on a student-athlete's academic or collegiate activities and would represent no cost to the institution. Many sports (most notably soccer) have organized outside competitions during semester breaks that have long been a tradition and a part of the sport's culture. Recently, student-athletes have been prohibited from enjoying voluntary organized recreational activities during vacation periods.

Committee Position (Eligibility Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 77 (NO. 2-70) SUMMER BASKETBALL LEAGUES — TRANSFER STUDENT

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete who is transferring from a four-year institution, has been officially accepted for enrollment at a second institution and receives permission from that institution to participate in an NCAA-sanctioned summer basketball league does not count on the summer-league roster as a representative of either institution.

Bylaws: Amend 14.8.5.2, page 154 as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.8.5.2 Additional Exceptions for Basketball Only:

"(a) Summer League — Divisions I and II. A student-athlete may compete during the period between June 15 and August 31 on a team in a league approved by the Council per 30.14, provided the student-athlete has received written permission from the institution's athletics director (or the director's official representative) for participation in the league. If the student-athlete is transferring and has been officially accepted for enrollment in a second institution, and the previous institution certifies that the student has withdrawn and does not intend to return to that institution for the next term, this written permission is to be obtained from the member institution to which the student-athlete is transferring. Under such circumstances, the student-athlete *would be countable on the summer league roster as a representative of the second member institution* **does not count on the summer-league roster as a representative of either institution.**"

[Remainder of 14.8.5.2 unchanged]

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale. Under current NCAA legislation, incoming senior prospective student-athletes and two-year college transfers do not count in the summer basketball limitations established for the institution that they will attend in the ensuing academic year. A student-athlete who is transferring from one four-year institution to another should be treated no differently than any other prospective student-athlete and should not be included in the summer basketball league limitations for the institution to which he or she will be transferring the next academic year, provided standard administrative conditions are fulfilled.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

NO. 78 (NO. 2-71) ELIGIBILITY COMMITTEE — APPEAL PROCEDURES

Intent: To permit a senior woman administrator to submit an appeal for restoration of a student-athlete's eligibility and to specify that a chief executive officer may designate an individual to submit such an appeal.

Bylaws: Amend 14.14.2, page 157, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.14.2 Participation in Appeal Hearing. Any appeal to restore a student-athlete's eligibility shall be submitted in the name of the institution by the chief executive officer (or an individual designated by the chief executive officer), faculty athletics representative, senior woman administrator or athletics director (for the men's or women's program), and. At least one of those individuals must participate in any hearing of the appeal that involves direct participation by the student-athlete or other individuals representing the institution or the student."

Source: NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Eligibility Committee believes that it is important to allow the institution's chief executive officer to designate an individual to submit an appeal to restore a student-athlete's eligibility and to permit the senior woman administrator to submit such an appeal.

Action: Adopted.

Financial Aid

NO. 79 (NO. 2-72) ON-CAMPUS EMPLOYMENT

Intent: To specify that earnings from on-campus employment outside the athletics department during the academic year count as institutional financial aid for team equivalency purposes only if the athletics interests of the institution intercede on behalf of the student-athlete, and to permit all on-campus employment earnings to be used to fulfill the minimum financial aid requirements applicable in Division I.

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.02.3.1, page 166, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.02.3.1 Institutional Financial Aid. The following sources of financial aid are considered to be institutional financial aid:

"(a) All funds administered by the institution (e.g., scholarships, grants, loans, work-study program assistance, on-campus employment (including work-study program assistance) in the athletics department, on-campus employment outside the athletics department for which the athlet-

ics interests of the institution intercede on behalf of the student-athlete (other than institutional staff members responsible for assisting all students in securing on-campus employment, including work study, in the same manner), tuition waivers);"

[Remainder of 15.02.3.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.1.2 by adding new 20.9.1.2.6, page 332, as follows:

[Division I only]

"20.9.1.2.6 On-Campus Employment. On-campus employment earnings during the academic year outside the athletics department for which athletics interests of the institution do not intercede on behalf of the student-athlete are not countable for team equivalency purposes per 15.02.3.1-(a) but may be counted in reaching the appropriate minimum."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: This legislation will treat on-campus earnings consistent with the criterion used for counting off-campus employment earnings. It will permit an institutional staff member (e.g., financial aid administrator) to assist a student-athlete in securing on-campus work study in the same manner as for all students. Concerns regarding abuses that led to the current rule that on-campus employment earnings are considered institutional financial aid may be outdated and no longer offer sufficient reason for the existing restriction. Finally, this type of financial aid would not be considered countable financial aid per 15.02.3.1, but may be counted in reaching applicable Division I minimum financial aid limits. A form will be developed to assist those Division I institutions that may want to count on-campus work study toward the Division I minimum financial aid requirements.

Action: Part A adopted. Part B adopted.

NO. 80 (NO. 2-73) ON-CAMPUS EMPLOYMENT

Intent: To apply the institutional financial aid limits related to on-campus employment on a federated basis and to specify that in Division II, earnings from on-campus employment outside the athletics department during the academic year count as institutional financial aid only if the athletics interests of the institution intercede on behalf of the student-athlete.

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.02.3.1, page 166, by deleting the current dominant voting requirement (*) and substituting a federated voting requirement (I/II/III).

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.02.3.1, page 166, as follows:

[Division II only]

"15.02.3.1 Institutional Financial Aid. The following sources of financial aid are considered to be institutional financial aid:

"(a) All funds administered by the institution (e.g., scholarships, grants, loans, work-study program assistance, on-campus employment (**including employment in the athletics department**) **except for on-campus employment outside the athletics department for which the athletic interests of the institution do not intercede on behalf of the student-athlete**, tuition waivers);"

[Remainder of 15.02.3.1 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The purpose of this legislation is to treat on-campus employment earnings in Division II consistent with the criterion used for counting off-campus employment earnings. Concerns regarding abuses that led to the current rule that all on-campus employment earnings are considered institutional financial aid may be outdated and no longer offer sufficient reason for the existing restriction.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee recommended that the sponsors withdraw this proposal in favor of Proposal No. 79 (2-72). The committee believes that the Council legislation is drafted more concisely to reflect the intent of the proposal and to treat on-campus employment activities that are part of work-study programs. The committee also recommended that if the sponsors do not wish to withdraw the proposal, they should be encouraged to modify the proposal consistent with part B of the Council's legislation to resolve the technical work-study problem referred to above.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 81 (NO. 2-75) FINANCIAL AID — EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS AND ATHLETICS PARTICIPATION COMPENSATION

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to exempt employment earnings and athletics participation earnings from his or her individual financial aid limits once eligibility has been exhausted.

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.1.1, pages 167-168, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"15.1.1 Types of Aid Included in Limit. In determining whether a student-athlete's financial aid exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid, all institutional financial aid (per 15.02.3.1) and all funds received from the following and similar sources shall be included:

[15.1.1-(a) through 15.1.1-(e) unchanged.]

"(f) Athletics Participation Compensation. Any other income (no matter when received or contracted for) from participation in an athletics event **unless eligibility has been exhausted in that sport**, and"

[Remainder of 15.1.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.2.6.4, pages 171-172, as follows:

[Division I only]

"15.2.6.4 After Eligibility Exhausted — Division I. Employment earnings of a student-athlete who has exhausted eligibility in a particular sport *during a prior term* shall be exempt from this limitation, provided the student-athlete subsequently does not practice or compete in intercollegiate athletics."

C. Bylaws: Amend 15.2.6.5, page 172, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"15.2.6.5 After Eligibility Exhausted — Divisions II and III. Employment earnings of a student-athlete who has exhausted eligibility in a particular sport *during the prior academic year* shall be exempt from this limitation, provided the student-athlete subsequently does not practice or compete in intercollegiate athletics."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Legislation was adopted at the 1993 NCAA Convention to permit Division I student-athletes who have exhausted eligibility in a prior term to exempt employment earnings from their individual financial aid limits. The Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism believes that this legislation only benefits student-athletes participating in fall sports or those attending schools using the quarter system. It would be more equitable for student-athletes in all divisions to exempt employment earnings from their financial aid limits once they have exhausted eligibility. This would include any compensation received for athletics participation that occurs after eligibility has been exhausted. The proposal retains the safeguard that a student-athlete using this exemption may not practice or compete again in intercollegiate athletics.

Action: Parts A and B adopted by Division I. Parts A and C adopted by Divisions II and III.

NO. 82 (NO. 2-74) STATE RECIPROCITY TUITION AGREEMENTS

Intent: To require that state reciprocity agreements be considered institutional financial aid for student-athletes participating in sports other than Division I football, basketball and ice hockey.

Bylaws: Amend 15.02.3.1, page 166, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.02.3.1 Institutional Financial Aid. The following sources of financial aid are considered to be institutional financial aid.

"(a) All funds administered by the institution (e.g., scholarships, grants, loans, work-study program assistance, on-campus employment, tuition waivers, **state reciprocity tuition agreements for student-athletes participating in sports other than Division I football, basketball and ice hockey**);"

[Remainder of 15.02.3.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

Effective Date: August 1, 1995; for student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1995.

Rationale: Under current NCAA legislation, state reciprocity tuition agreements are not considered institutional financial aid, creating competitive advantages at the conference and national levels for those institutions that have reciprocal tuition agreements with neighboring states. In addition, this proposal would exempt those sports in which recruited student-athletes can be considered "counters" without receipt of athletically related financial aid.

Action: Motion to refer to NCAA Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism adopted.

NO. 83 (NO. 2-76) FINANCIAL AID — PERMISSIBLE FEES

Intent: To apply the legislation related to the waiver of a prospective student-athlete's processing fees on a federated basis, and to permit Divisions I and II institutions to waive, pay in advance or guarantee payment of processing fees (application fees) for prospective student-athletes.

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.2.1.4, pages 168-169, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.2.1.4 Fees and Related Expenses for Prospects. An institution shall not waive, pay in advance or guarantee payment of the following expenses for a prospective student-athlete, unless such benefits generally conform to institutional policy as it applies to other prospective student-grantees:

"(a) The institution's processing fee required prior to the admissions office's evaluation of the prospect's application;"

[15.2.1.4-(b) through 15.2.1.4-(g), relettered as 15.2.1.4-(a) through 15.2.1.4-(f), and 15.2.1.4.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.2.1.4 by adding new 15.2.1.4.2, page 169, as follows:

A-118 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"15.2.1.4.2 Processing Fee — Divisions I and II. A Division I and II institution may waive, pay in advance or guarantee payment of the institution's processing fees (application fees) for prospective student-athletes applying to the institution."

C. Bylaws: Amend 15.2.1.4, pages 168-169, as follows:

[Division III only]

"15.2.1.4 Fees and Related Expenses for Prospects. An institution shall not waive, pay in advance or guarantee payment of the following expenses for a prospective student-athlete, unless such benefits generally conform to institutional policy as it applies to other prospective student-grantees:

"(a) **In Division III, the institution's processing fee required prior to the admissions office's evaluation of the prospect's application;**"

[15.2.1.4-(a) through 15.2.1.4-(f), relettered as 15.2.1.4-(b) through 15.2.1.4-(g), and 15.2.1.4.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Although an institution can waive the processing fees for prospective student-athletes if the institution has a similar policy for other prospective student-grantees, most institutions do not know who the prospective student-grantees will be at the time an enrollment application is being completed. This proposal is permissive legislation and would not require Divisions I and II institutions to pay for such fees; further, the proposed legislation would be easier to apply than the current rule, which appears to be applied inconsistently among various institutions. Although the proposal may appear to increase costs, institutions should accrue some cost savings in not having to process the reimbursement of such fees for student-athletes who later receive athletics grants. Finally, this proposal will not change the current application of this legislation in Division III.

Action: Part A defeated. Parts B and C moot.

NO. 84 (NO. 2-77) FINANCIAL AID — PELL GRANT

Intent: To permit student-athletes in Division II to receive Pell Grant assistance in combination with other institutional financial aid, provided the overall grant total does not exceed the value of a full grant plus \$1,500, or the student-athlete's cost of attendance, whichever is less.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.4.1, page 170, as follows:

[Division II only]

"15.2.4.1 Pell Grants. A student-athlete may receive a Pell

Legislative Proposals _____ A-119

Grant in combination with other institutional financial aid, provided the overall grant total does not exceed the value of a full grant-in-aid plus \$2,400 in Division I institutions or \$900 \$1,500 in Division II institutions, or the student-athlete's cost of attendance per 15.01.7 (in Division I institutions, as determined by the institution's regular financial aid authority), whichever is less "

Source: All members of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Many needy and lower-income student-athletes who receive athletics grants-in-aid in combination with Pell Grants receive significantly less than the actual cost of attendance and, in some cases, less than a needy student who is not receiving an athletics grant. This proposal allows a moderate increase in the Pell Grant allowance to help those students while continuing to maintain a cost-control differential between Division I and Division II institutions. In addition, since Division II does not have a special assistance fund as in Division I, increasing the Pell Grant allowance offers another mechanism to aid needy student-athletes.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee voted to defer to the Council's position, which is to support this proposal, inasmuch as the Council is in a better position to evaluate the competing interests of the legislation (i.e., cutting costs and benefiting needy student-athletes) with its broader Division II representation.

Action: Adopted by Division II; motion to reconsider defeated.

NO. 85 (NO. 2-78) FINANCIAL AID FROM OUTSIDE SOURCE — ATHLETICS PARTICIPATION NOT MAJOR CRITERION

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to receive aid from an outside source that uses athletics participation as a minor criterion for awarding the aid and to permit the recipient's choice of institutions to be restricted by the donor, provided the recipient's choice is not limited to one designated institution or conference.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.5.3, pages 170-171, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.2.5.3 Athletics Participation Not Major Criterion. A student-athlete may receive financial aid through an established and continuing program to aid students, provided the following conditions are met:

[15.2.5.3-(a) and 15.2.5.3-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) The recipient's choice of institutions shall not be restricted to a single designated institution or conference by the donor of the aid."

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Based on current official interpretations, any financial aid award administered outside of the institution that permits an applicant to include athletics participation or achievements on the application form as part of his or her extracurricular activities must not restrict the recipient's choice of institutions in any way. The sponsors support the original intent of controlling outside booster groups from awarding scholarships that would essentially "feed" prospects into specific institutions. However, there are many legitimate outside organizations with scholarships that consider extracurricular activities and may require a student-athlete to attend an institution within a particular state or region of the country (e.g., state assemblies, religious organizations, or other groups that assist students to attend institutions in a specific state or with specific denominational/ethnic backgrounds).

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee recommended to the sponsors that this proposal be amended to indicate that "the recipient's choice of institution shall not be restricted to a single designated institution or conference by the donor of the aid." [Note: This change was made by the sponsors.]

The committee also recommended to the Council that it withdraw Proposal No. 86 (2-79) in favor of this proposal inasmuch as this proposal is more consistent with the committee's original intent.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 86 (NO. 2-79) FINANCIAL AID FROM OUTSIDE SOURCES

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to receive an educational scholarship from an outside source, provided the donor does not restrict the recipient's choice of institutions to a single designated institution.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.5.3 and 15.2.5.4, pages 170-171, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.2.5.3 Athletics Participation Not Major Criterion. A student-athlete may receive financial aid through an established and continuing program to aid students, provided the following conditions are met:

[15.2.5.3-(a) and 15.2.5.3-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) The recipient's choice of institutions shall not be restricted to a single designated institution by the donor of the aid.

"15.2.5.4 Athletics Participation As a Major Criterion. A stu-

dent-athlete may receive financial aid through an established and continuing program for the recognition of outstanding high-school graduates, provided the following conditions are met:

[15.2.5.4-(a) and 15.2.5.4-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) The recipient's choice of institutions shall not be restricted to a single designated institution by the donor of the aid;"

[Remainder of 15.2.5.4 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: An official interpretation indicates that a scholarship award administered outside of the institution that permits an applicant to include athletics participation or achievements on the application form as part of his or her extracurricular activities must be administered in accordance with the provisions of 15.2.5.3 or 15.2.5.4 (e.g., the scholarship may not restrict the recipient's choice of institution). There are many legitimate outside organizations whose scholarship awards may require a student-athlete to attend an institution within a particular state or region of the country. Specifying that donors may not restrict the choice of institutions to a single designated institution would permit student-athletes to receive these awards without creating an unfair advantage for those schools that have student-athletes receiving such an award.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 87 (NO. 2-87) MAXIMUM AWARDS — DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent: To reduce from 65 to 45 the maximum annual limit of financial aid awards (equivalencies) in Division I-AA football with a graduated, four-year reduction beginning in the 1994-95 academic year.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.5.2, page 184, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"15.5.5.2 Division I-AA Football. There shall be an annual limit of 30 on the number of initial counters (per 15.02.2.1); an annual limit of 67 during the 1992-93 academic year, 65 during the 1993-94 academic year, and 63 60 during the 1994-95 academic year, 55 during the 1995-96 academic year, 50 during the 1996-97 academic year, and 45 during the 1997-98 academic year and thereafter on the value of financial aid awards (equivalencies) to counters, and an annual limit of 92 during the 1992-93 academic year, 88 during the 1993-94 academic year, and 85 during the 1994-95 academic year and thereafter on the total number of counters (including initial counters) in the sport of football at each Division I-AA institution."

Source. Austin Peay State University, Eastern Washington Univer-

sity, Idaho State University, University of Montana, Montana State University, Morehead State University, Northern Arizona University, University of Tennessee at Martin, Tennessee State University, Tennessee Technological University, Weber State University and Western Illinois University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: In an April 1993 survey of 114 Division I-AA institutions, 64 of the 99 schools that responded favored this proposed legislation. There are various reasons at the different campuses for supporting a significant reduction in football grants, but some reasons common to many schools include: (1) increasingly difficult funding problems in higher education; (2) an interest in providing more opportunities for women's athletics, and (3) the belief that such reductions will result in better competition on the field. The sponsors understand that several Division I-AA institutions have the desire to retain the current financial aid limits; however, the significant needs of a clear majority of Division I-AA members to fund football at a more comfortable level outweigh the reasonable interests of the minority. In addition, it appears that national and regional competition will be better with the top talent being available to more schools.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Defeated by Division I-AA (22-63, 33 abstentions).

NO. 88 (NO. 2-88) MAXIMUM AWARDS — DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent: To reduce from 63 to 55 the maximum annual limit of financial aid awards (equivalencies) in Division I-AA football with a graduated four-year reduction beginning in the 1995-96 academic year.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.5.2, page 184, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"15.5.5.2 Division I-AA Football. There shall be an annual limit of 30 on the number of initial counters (per 15.02.2.1); an annual limit of 67 during the 1992-93 academic year, 65 during the 1993-94 academic year, and 63 during the 1994-95 academic year, 61 during the 1995-96 academic year, 59 during the 1996-97 academic year, 57 during the 1997-98 academic year and 55 during the 1998-99 academic year and thereafter on the value of financial aid awards (equivalencies) to counters, and an annual limit of 92 during the 1992-93 academic year, 88 during the 1993-94 academic year, and 85 during the 1994-95 academic year and thereafter on the total number of counters (including initial counters) in the sport of football at each Division I-AA institution."

Source: Illinois State University, Nicholls State University, University of North Texas, Northeast Louisiana University, University of

Northern Iowa, Northwestern State University (Louisiana), Southwest Missouri State University and Western Illinois University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1995.

Rationale: The issue of cost containment has been, and continues to be, of primary importance to those institutions operating Division I-AA football programs. It is recognized that further reductions in the number of equivalency awards provided in the sport of football permits institutions to realize cost savings while maintaining a commitment to operate football programs at the Division I level. Reducing the number of equivalency awards to 55 affords institutions the opportunity to realize necessary financial savings while continuing to maintain a clear line between Divisions I and II.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Defeated by Division I-AA (35-51, 31 abstentions).

NO. 89 (NO. 2-83) FINANCIAL AID — DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL EXCEPTION

Intent: To specify that Division I-AA football programs that do not provide athletically related financial aid to football student-athletes are exempt from the Division I-AA football counter and initial-counter requirements.

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.5.1.2.1 by adding new 15.5.1.2.1.1, page 179, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"15.5.1.2.1.1 Exception — Division I-AA Football. Division I-AA football programs that meet the following criteria are exempt from the Division I-AA football counter and initial-counter requirements of 15.5.1 and 15.5.5:

"(a) In the sport of football, the institution awards financial aid only to student-athletes who demonstrate financial need, except that loans, academic honor awards, nonathletics achievement awards, or on-campus employment and certain aid from outside sources may be provided without regard to financial need;

"(b) The institution uses a system for analyzing need that conforms to a uniform methodology approved by the U.S. Department of Education, and

"(c) The composition of the financial aid package offered to football student-athletes is consistent with the policy established for offering financial assistance to all students. The financial aid packages for football student-athletes also shall meet the following criteria:

"(1) The institution shall not consider athletics ability as a criterion in the formulation of any football student-athlete's financial aid package, and

"(2) The procedures used to award financial aid to football student-athletes must be the same as the existing financial aid procedures utilized for all students at the institution."

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.5.5.2 by adding new 15.5.5.2.1, page 184, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"15.5.5.2.1 Exception — Division I-AA Football. Division I-AA football programs that meet the following criteria are exempt from the Division I-AA football counter and initial-counter requirements of 15.5.1 and 15.5.5:

"(a) In the sport of football, the institution awards financial aid only to student-athletes who demonstrate financial need, except loans, academic honor awards, nonathletics achievement awards, or on-campus employment and certain aid from outside sources may be provided without regard to financial need;

"(b) The institution uses a system for analyzing need that conforms to a uniform methodology approved by the U.S. Department of Education, and

"(c) The composition of the financial aid package offered to football student-athletes is consistent with the policy established for offering financial assistance to all students. The financial aid packages for football student-athletes also shall meet the following criteria:

"(1) The institution shall not consider athletics ability as a criterion in the formulation of any football student-athlete's financial aid package, and

"(2) The procedures used to award financial aid to football student-athletes must be the same as the existing financial aid procedures utilized for all students at the institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Most institutions that are playing Division I-AA football because of the elimination of multidivision classification are private institutions on residential campuses. A very high percentage of students attending these institutions receive some financial assistance (e.g., loans, institutional work, tuition remission, grants). Even in programs such as those where no athletically related aid is awarded, the receipt of loans and institutional work study by a student-athlete can "trigger" the definition of a "counter" under NCAA legislation. This can make almost all football student-athletes at such Division I-AA institutions "counters," even though the students do not receive athletics aid. This legislation would permit Division I-AA football programs that do not provide athletics aid to be exempted from the initial-counter and the overall-counter legislation.

Action: Adopted by Division I-AA.

NO. 90 (NO. 2-82) FINANCIAL AID — DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent: To permit a recruited student-athlete in Division I-AA football to receive institutional financial aid and engage in varsity competition without being considered a counter, provided the aid is granted without regard to athletics ability as certified in writing by the faculty athletics director and director of athletics.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.1.2, pages 179-180, as follows:
[Division I-AA football only]

"15.5.1.2 Recruited Student-Athlete

"15.5.1.2.1 Division I Football, Basketball or Ice Hockey, Varsity Competition. In Division I football, basketball or ice hockey, a student-athlete who was recruited by the awarding institution and who receives institutional financial aid (as set forth in 15.02.3.1) granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability does not have to be counted until the student-athlete engages in varsity intercollegiate competition (as opposed to freshman, B-team, subvarsity, intramural or club competition) in those sports. For this provision to be applicable, there shall be on file in the office of the athletics director certification by the faculty athletics representative, the admissions officer and the chair of the financial aid committee that the student's admission and financial aid were granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability.

[15.5.1.2.2 unchanged.]

"15.5.1.2.3 Sports Other Than Football, Basketball and Ice Hockey. In all sports other than football, basketball and ice hockey in Division I and in all sports in Division II, a student-athlete who was recruited by the awarding institution and who is receiving institutional financial aid (as set forth in 15.02.3.1) shall be a counter unless there is on file in the office of the athletics director certification by the faculty athletics representative and the director of financial aid that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability."

[Remainder of 15.5.1.2 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Ivy Group, Eastern Washington University, Florida A&M University, University of Idaho, Idaho State University, University of Montana, Montana State University, Northern Arizona University and Weber State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994, for current Division I-AA football programs that were reclassified as members of Division I-AA on September 1, 1993, as a result of the implementation of legislation to eliminate multidivision classification; August 1, 1994, for all football programs first established and classified in Division I-AA as of September 1, 1993, or September 1, 1994; August 1, 1995, for all other member institutions.

Rationale: If the number of permissible grants for Division I-AA football is reduced below the current level of 63 for the 1994-95 academic year, it may become difficult for institutions to recruit a sufficient number of student-athletes in Division I-AA football. This provision would allow Division I-AA institutions to recruit prospective student-athletes who could receive nonathletically related financial aid from the institution without including those student-athletes in the institution's initial or overall financial aid limitations.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 91 (NO. 2-81) FINANCIAL AID — DIVISION I ICE HOCKEY

Intent: To permit a recruited student-athlete in Division I ice hockey to receive institutional financial aid and engage in varsity competition without being considered a counter, provided the aid is granted without regard to athletics ability as certified in writing by the faculty athletics representative and director of athletics.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5, pages 179-187, as follows:
[Division I only]

"15.5 MAXIMUM INSTITUTIONAL GRANT-IN-AID LIMITATIONS BY SPORT

"15.5.1 Counters. A student-athlete shall be a counter and included in the maximum awards limitations set forth in this bylaw under the following conditions.

[15.5.1.1 unchanged.]

"15.5.1.2 Recruited Student-Athlete

"15.5.1.2.1 Division I Football, or Basketball or Ice Hockey, Varsity Competition. In Division I football, or basketball or ice hockey, a student-athlete who was recruited by the awarding institution and who receives institutional financial aid (as set forth in 15.02.3.1) granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability does not have to be counted until the student-athlete engages in varsity intercollegiate competition (as opposed to freshman, B-team, subvarsity, intramural or club competition) in those sports. For this provision to be applicable, there shall be on file in the office of the athletics director certification by the faculty athletics representative, the admissions officer and the chair of the financial aid committee that the student's admission and financial aid were granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability.

"15.5.1.2.2 Division I Football, or Basketball or Ice Hockey — Partial Qualifier. In Division I football, or basketball or ice hockey, a student-athlete who is a partial qualifier

(as set forth in 14.02.9.2) and who was recruited by the awarding institution and who receives institutional financial aid that is not from athletics sources and that is based on financial need only (as set forth in 14.3.2.1.1) shall be a counter and included in the maximum awards limitations set forth in this bylaw when the student-athlete participates in an institutional practice session or represents the institution against outside competition.

"15.5.1.2.3 Sports Other Than Football, and Basketball and Ice Hockey. In all sports other than football, and basketball and ice hockey in Division I and in all sports in Division II, a student-athlete who was recruited by the awarding institution and who is receiving institutional financial aid (as set forth in 15.02.3.1) shall be a counter unless there is on file in the office of the athletics director certification by the faculty athletics representative and the director of financial aid that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability."

[Remainder of 15.5 unchanged.]

Source: Brown University, Clarkson University, Colgate University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, Princeton University, Rennselaer Polytechnic Institute, St. Lawrence University, Union College (New York), University of Vermont and Yale University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: In its attempt to comply with the cost-containment goals of the NCAA Presidents Commission, the Division I ice hockey membership successfully gained the adoption of Proposal No. 31 at the 1993 NCAA Convention, establishing reasonable and acceptable equivalency and head-count limits on ice hockey grants-in-aid. In addition, however, that proposal also imposed an unintentional restriction on Division I ice hockey programs, requiring that recruited student-athletes receiving institutional financial aid granted without regard to athletics ability be counted against the equivalency and head-count limits. Similar nonathletically related financial aid for student-athletes in all sports other than football and basketball is not countable. Ice hockey should be treated no differently from those other sports. This proposal corrects the unintended restriction and the present inequity.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 92 (NO. 2-84) MAXIMUM AWARDS — WOMEN'S GYMNASTICS

Intent: To increase the maximum number of grants-in-aid in Division I women's gymnastics from 10 to 12.

A-128 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

sion I women's gymnastics from 10 to 12.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.2.1, page 181, as follows:
[Division I only]

"15.5.2.1 Maximum Limits. An institution shall be limited in any academic year to the total number of counters (head count) in each of the following sports:

"Division I:

"Women's Gymnastics.....10 12"

[Remainder of 15.5.2.1 unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; University of Arizona; Boise State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of Florida; University of Georgia; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; Oregon State University; Stanford University, and University of Utah.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: This proposal is presented in anticipation of an increase in squad size from 12 to 15 and an increase in the number of allowable competitors (from six to seven) per event in collegiate competition. These changes have been recommended by the Gymnastics Coaches Association and are being considered by the NCAA Women's Gymnastics Committee. Due to the high skill level of intercollegiate gymnastics, there is a need to increase the squad size to enable substitution of gymnasts in the lineup and to facilitate rest and reduce injuries. The increase in financial aid limits would allow two additional gymnasts the opportunity to compete. In addition, these changes would permit a significant increase in participation in the sport, which would assist in improving the proportionate financial aid limits under Title IX guidelines.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee took no position on this proposal; however, the committee agreed to inform the sponsors that this stance was taken because the Council referred the Gender Equity Task Force's proposal related to increased scholarship limits in women's sports to the committee for further review. Thus, the maximum financial aid awards permitted in women's gymnastics and in all other women's sports will be reviewed by the committee prior to the 1995 NCAA Convention.

Action: Motion to refer to appropriate NCAA committee adopted by Division I.

Playing and Practice Seasons

NO. 93 (NO. 2-102) REQUIRED DAY OFF DURING PLAYING SEASON

Intent: To eliminate the required one-day-off-per-week restriction

Legislative Proposals _____ A-129

during NCAA championship participation.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.4, page 215, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.1.5.4 Required Day Off — Playing Season. During the playing season, all countable athletically related activities (per 17.02.1.1) shall be prohibited during one calendar day per week **except during participation in NCAA championships.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.6.1, page 216, as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.1.6.1 Football and Basketball and Traditional Segments in All Other Sports. All countable athletically related activities shall be prohibited during one calendar day per week in the sports of football and basketball and during the traditional segment in all other sports, **except during participation in NCAA championships.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Current NCAA legislation specifies that all countable athletically related activities are prohibited during one calendar day per week in all sports in Divisions I and II, and in football and basketball, and during the traditional segment in Division III. The adoption of this proposal will accommodate realistic travel and practice requirements necessitated by NCAA championships participation.

Action: Part A adopted by Divisions I and II. Part B adopted by Division III.

NO. 94 (NO. 2-97) SAFETY EXCEPTION — INDIVIDUAL SPORTS

Intent: In Division I, to permit coaches in all individual sports to be present during voluntary individual workouts in the institution's regular practice facility and spot or provide safety or skill instruction without the workouts being considered as countable athletically related activities

Bylaws: Amend 17.02.1.2.1, page 211, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.02.1.2.1 Divisions I and II Safety Exception. **In all individual sports, per 17.02.15.2, A** a coach may be present during voluntary individual workouts in the institution's regular practice facility (without the workouts being considered as countable athletically related activities) *in the following situations*, and the coach may spot or provide safety or skill instruction but cannot conduct the individual's workouts."

[17.02.1.2.1-(a) through 17.02.1.2.1-(f) deleted; 17.02.1.2.1-(g), relettered as 17.02.1.2.1-(a), unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal, which will extend the safety exception to all individual sports in Division I, will permit coaches to be present to adequately supervise voluntary workouts for safety reasons.

Committee Position (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports): The committee voted to oppose this proposal. The four individual sports that currently do not have safety exceptions are cross country, golf, tennis and wrestling. The committee noted that more study was needed before it could be determined that the presence of coaches at voluntary workouts in these activities was necessary for safety reasons. The committee also is concerned about those sports that currently have such an exemption. For example, overuse has been documented as an injury concern in gymnastics and swimming. Not having the practice, rather than having a coach present at such a practice, may best address this safety concern. The committee intends to review the rationale used to exempt those sports that currently are included in 17.02.1.2.1.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 95 (NO. 2-98) SAFETY EXCEPTION — WRESTLING

Intent: In Division I, to permit a wrestling coach to be present during voluntary individual wrestling workouts in the institution's regular practice facility and provide safety or skill instruction without the workouts being considered as countable athletically related activities.

Bylaws: Amend 17.02.1.2.1, page 211, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.02.1.2.1 Divisions I and II Safety Exception. A coach may be present during voluntary individual workouts in the institution's regular practice facility (without the workouts being considered as countable athletically related activities) in the following situations, and the coach may spot or provide safety or skill instruction but cannot conduct the individual's workouts:

[17.02.1.2.1-(a) through 17.02.1.2.1-(g) unchanged.]

"(h) Wrestling—When the student-athlete is engaged in wrestling."

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Safety exceptions presently are permitted in fencing, gymnastics, rifle, skiing, swimming and diving, track and field, and water polo. This proposal would extend the opportunity for Division I wrestling coaches to adequately supervise voluntary workouts of student-athletes in wrestling. NCAA injury surveillance data indicate that wrestling is the sport in which injuries per hour of activity are most prevalent, and that this problem is

most acute in practice, not competition. Even in a controlled environment with protective mats, competent professional supervision by a trained coach is essential to minimize injuries that are inherent in a sport that involves throwing, tumbling, stressful bending and twisting of the neck, back and limbs.

Committee Position (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports): The committee voted to oppose this proposal. The rationale for this position is discussed in Proposal No. 94 (2-97).

Action: Adopted upon reconsideration by Division I.

NO. 96 (NO. 2-100) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — DIVISION II

Intent: In Division II, to permit athletics department staff members to participate in eight hours of skill-related workouts with student-athletes outside of the team's designated playing and practice season during the academic year; to limit the unsupervised use of an institution's athletics facilities by student-athletes during the academic year, and to eliminate the safety exception for all sports.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.2, page 215, as follows:
[Division II only]

"17.1.5.2 Weekly Hour Limitations — Outside of Playing Season. **In Division I**, outside of the playing season, only a student-athlete's participation in the countable athletically related activities specified in 17.02.1.1-(c) and 17.02.1.1-(d) shall be permitted. A student-athlete's participation in such activities shall be limited to a maximum of eight hours per week. **In Division II, outside of the playing season, a student-athlete may participate in eight hours of any countable athletically related activity set forth in 17.02.1.1. Practice (as specified in 17.02.1.2) shall be limited to noncontact drills and no protective equipment shall be worn during practice sessions.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.1.2, page 210, as follows:
[Division II only]

"17.02.1.2 Noncountable Athletically Related Activities. The following are considered noncountable athletically related activities and are not counted in the weekly or daily time limitations specified under 17.1.5.1 for Divisions I and II:

[17.02.1.2-(a) through 17.02.1.2-(o) unchanged.]

"(p) Use of an institution's athletics facilities (which **in Division I only** may be reserved for student-athletes during the academic year, *but not* and during the summer *except*, in Divisions I and II, **only** to participate in permissible individual workouts in individual sports per 17.02.1.2.2) by student-athletes, provided the activities are not supervised by or held at the direction of any member of an institution's coaching staff. In the event that the use of an institution's facilities is

requested by a team composed partly of enrolled student-athletes and partly of individuals not otherwise affiliated with the institution, use of the facilities shall be consistent with the policies established for outside groups generally. In a Division III institution, the use of an institution's athletics facilities by a student-athlete shall be to the same extent that facilities are utilized by students generally;"

[Remainder of 17.02.1.2 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.1.2.1, page 211, as follows:
[Division II only]

"17.02.1.2.1 Divisions I and II — *Safety Exception* A coach may be present during voluntary individual workouts in the institution's regular practice facility (without the workouts being considered as countable athletically related activities) in the following situations, and the coach may spot or provide safety or skill instruction but cannot conduct the individual's workouts.

"(a) *Fencing* — When the student-athlete uses fencing equipment;

"(b) *Gymnastics* — When the student-athlete uses gymnastics equipment;

"(c) *Rifle* — When the student-athlete is shooting;

"(d) *Skiing* — when the student-athlete is engaged in skiing;

"(e) *Swimming and diving* — When the student-athlete is engaged in swimming and diving;

"(f) *Track and field* — When the student-athlete is engaged in field events, and

"(g) *Water polo* — When the student-athlete is engaged in water polo."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: In 1991, the NCAA adopted legislation intended to reduce the time demands on student-athletes. The Division II Steering Committee believes that this proposal is consistent with the spirit of the original legislation, but also sees this as an opportunity to deregulate the current application of the rule. This proposal will allow coaches and student-athletes to work together in skill-related activities during off hours, which currently are restricted to only conditioning activities. This proposal is intended to provide flexibility to permit student-athletes and coaches more realistic time to prepare for athletics competition. It also eliminates the need for sport-by-sport exceptions by recognizing that all student-athletes want to improve their abilities rather than spend extra time on strength and conditioning, and allows for coaches in all sports to be involved for safety reasons for up to eight hours outside the playing and practice season. The steering committee also believes that reserving facilities for unsupervised workouts imposes an unnecessary liability risk on the institution that will no longer be necessary if coaches can work with student-athletes during these eight hours.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

**NO. 97 (NO. 2-99) LENGTH OF SEASON — DIVISIONS I
AND II SOFTBALL AND WOMEN'S
VOLLEYBALL**

Intent: In the sports of Divisions I and II softball and women's volleyball, to increase an institution's declared playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) from 22 to 24 weeks, and to reduce from 20 to 15 the number of hours per week during which student-athletes in those sports may participate in countable athletically related activities during the non-traditional segment.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.1, page 215, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.1.5.1 Daily and Weekly Hour Limitations — Playing Season. **In sports other than softball and women's volleyball,** A student-athlete's participation in countable athletically related activities (see 17.02.1.1) shall be limited to a maximum of four hours per day and 20 hours per week. **In the sports of softball and women's volleyball, a student-athlete's participation in countable athletically related activities shall be limited to a maximum of four hours per day and 20 hours per week during the traditional segment, and a maximum of four hours per day and 15 hours per week during the nontraditional segment.**"

[Remainder of 17.1.5.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.15.1, page 274, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.15.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) in softball shall be limited to the following:

"(a) Divisions I and II — A maximum of 22 **24** weeks."

[Remainder of 17.15.1 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.19.1, page 292, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.19.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) in volleyball shall be limited to the following:

"(a) Divisions I and II — A maximum of 22 weeks:

"(1) **Men — A maximum of 22 weeks.**

"(2) **Women — A maximum of 24 weeks.**"

[Remainder of 17.9.1 unchanged.]

Source: Auburn University; Butler University; California State University, Fresno; DePaul University; University of Hawaii; University of Northern Kentucky; Ohio State University, and Western Illinois University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The proposed 24-week limitation would be identical to the current playing season for individual-sport athletes, which appears to be a manageable playing season for a student-athlete. Under current legislation, the nontraditional season for team sports generally is conducted within six- or seven-week periods. Six weeks allows 120 hours of practice. Eight weeks, at 15 hours per week, also allows 120 hours of practice. For the student-athletes, the benefits of the reduction in hours per week are significant from both an academic and physical standpoint. Further, 15 hours of training time will help reduce the number of teams practicing at 5:30 a.m. or 10 p.m. to accommodate the limited availability of facilities during the off season. Finally, practicing fewer hours per day over a longer period of time is more conducive to academic achievement.

Committee Position (Divisions I and II Steering Committees):
The committees voted to oppose this proposal.

Action: Defeated by Division I; not moved in Division II.

**NO. 98 (NO. 2-101) WEEKLY HOUR LIMITATIONS —
SOFTBALL AND WOMEN'S
VOLLEYBALL**

Intent: In the sports of Divisions I and II softball and women's volleyball outside the playing season, to reduce from eight to six hours per week the time that student-athletes may be involved in countable athletically related activities; to permit coaches to be involved in individual workout sessions with each student-athlete for two hours per week, and to place a limit of three on the total number of student-athletes who may be present at any workout session.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.2 by adding new 17.1.5.2.1, page 215, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"**17.1.5.2.1 Softball and Women's Volleyball — Exception.** In the sports of softball and women's volleyball, activities set forth in 17.02.1.1-(c) and 17.02.1.1-(d) shall be limited to a maximum of six hours per week. Activities set forth in 17.02.1.1-(h) are permitted, but shall be limited to a maximum of two hours per week for each student-athlete and there shall be a limit of three student-athletes who may be present at any such workout session."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.15.6, page 277, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.15.6 Out-of-Season Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in countable athletically related activities outside the institution's

declared playing season per 17.15.1, **except that individual workout activities set forth in 17.02.1.1-(h) are permitted, but shall be limited to a maximum of two hours per week for each student-athlete and there shall be a limit of three student-athletes who may be present at any such workout session.**"

[Remainder of 17.15.6 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.19.10, page 296, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.19.10 Out-of-Season Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in countable athletically related activities outside the institution's declared playing season per 17.19.1, **except that individual workout activities set forth in 17.02.1.1-(h) are permitted, but shall be limited to a maximum of two hours per week for each student-athlete and there shall be a limit of three student-athletes who may be present at any such workout session.**"

[Remainder of 17.19.10 unchanged.]

Source: Auburn University; California State University, Fresno; DePaul University; University of Florida; University of Hawaii; Marquette University; Northern Kentucky University; Ohio State University, and Western Illinois University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Student-athletes want to improve their abilities in their particular sport rather than spend extra time on strength and conditioning activities. Four hours per week is sufficient for strength and conditioning activities when combined with a minimal amount of time for individual skill improvement. This proposal would reduce from eight hours to six hours per week the time spent on strength and conditioning activities during the academic year outside of the institution's playing season, thus allowing student-athletes more time for other nonathletics activities. The limit on the number of student-athletes per workout session makes it unlikely that team training will occur while still providing an avenue for skill development.

Committee Position (Divisions I and II Steering Committees): The Division I Steering Committee took no position on this proposal. The Division II Steering Committee voted to oppose this proposal, inasmuch as it is sponsoring another proposal related to the same issue [Proposal No. 96 (2-100)].

Action: Defeated by Division I; not moved in Division II.

NO. 99 (NO. 2-103) DIVISION I SOFTBALL — NATIONAL INVITATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Intent: To exclude the National Invitational Championship from counting in an institution's declared playing season in the sport

of softball and to exempt participation in the championship from the institution's maximum number of softball contests.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.8, pages 216-217, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.1.8 General Regulations for Computing Playing Seasons Applicable to All Sports

[17.1.8-(a) through 17.1.8-(g) unchanged.]

"(h) Non-NCAA Postseason Championship Participation. Practice and/or competition in non-NCAA (or non-NAIA) postseason championships (e.g., an invitational tournament scheduled after a conference championship) must be counted against the institution's declared playing season limitation; **except that practice and competition for the National Invitational Softball Championship in softball and for one postseason championship in each non-NCAA championship sport used for sports sponsorship purposes pursuant to Bylaws 20.9.3.2.1 (Division I), 20.10.3.4.1 (Division II) or 20.11.3.1.1 (Division III), is exempt from the institution's declared playing-season limitation in the sport, and"**

[Remainder of 17.1.8 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.15.5.3, pages 275-277, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.15.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of softball contests shall exclude the following:

[17.15.5.3-(a) through 17.15.5.3-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) **National Invitational Championship. Competition in the National Invitational Softball Championship;**"

[17.15.5.3-(e) through 17.15.5.3-(m) relettered as 17.15.5.3-(f) through 17.15.5.3-(n), unchanged.]

Source: DePaul University; Eastern Illinois University; University of Hawaii; Northeast Louisiana University; Southwest Missouri State University; Ohio State University; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, and Western Illinois University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: A National Invitational Softball Championship has been held for the past five years for those teams deemed worthy of postseason competition, but that are not selected for participation in the NCAA Division I Softball Championship. This proposal would specify that practice held in preparation for and participation in the National Invitational Softball Championship are excluded from the maximum number of weeks in the declared playing and practice season and from the maximum number of dates of competition in softball. This postseason tournament involves competition between teams that are not identified until the close of the regular season.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The committee voted to support this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 100 (NO. 2-104) VOLLEYBALL — NATIONAL INVITATIONAL VOLLEYBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Intent: In Division I, to exempt practice for and competition in the National Invitational Volleyball Championship from counting against an institution's declared playing season in the sport of volleyball.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.8, pages 216-217, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.1.8 General Regulations for Computing Playing Seasons Applicable to All Sports

[17.1.8-(a) through 17.1.8-(g) unchanged.]

"(h) Non-NCAA Postseason Championships Participation. Practice and/or competition in non-NCAA (or non-NAIA) post-season championships (e.g., an invitational tournament scheduled after a conference championship) must be counted against the institution's declared playing-season limitation; except that practice and competition for the **National Invitational Volleyball Championship** and for one post-season championship in each non-NCAA championship sport used for sports sponsorship purposes pursuant to Bylaws 20.9.3.2.1 (Division I), 20.10.3.4.1 (Division II) or 20.11.3.1.1 (Division III), *is* **are** exempt from the institution's declared playing-season limitation in the sport, and"

[Remainder of 17.1.8 unchanged.]

Source: California State University, Fresno; University of Delaware; DePaul University; Santa Clara University; Southwest Missouri State University; Texas Tech University; Washington State University, and Wright State University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The National Invitational Volleyball Championship (NIVC) provides opportunities for 20 women's volleyball teams to participate in a championship opportunity. This event has been a catalyst for program improvement as teams and conferences strive toward participation in the NCAA championship. However, the teams that are successful enough to be invited to the NIVC find themselves with one week of practice time consumed when preparing for the tournament. This, in effect, is a penalty for success; their peers that participate in the NCAA tournament do not lose that week. Modifying this bylaw would put all teams back on equal footing for the length of their traditional and nontraditional playing seasons.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The Division I Steering Committee voted to support this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 101 (NO. 2-108) FIRST CONTEST DATE — DIVISION I BASEBALL

Intent: To establish March 1 as the first permissible contest date during the traditional segment in Division I baseball.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.2.3.1, page 221, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.2.3 First Contest Date. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in each segment in baseball prior to the following dates:

"17.2.3.1 Traditional Segment

"(a) **Division I — March 1.**

"(a)(b) Divisions I and II — September 7."

[17.2.3.1-(b), relettered as 17.2.3.1-(c), and remainder of 17.2.3 unchanged.]

B. Resolution:

[Division I only]

"Whereas, the existing playing season in Division I baseball significantly undermines the Presidents Commission's emphasis on academics by forcing institutions to schedule the majority of their games in a short period of time just prior to and during final examination periods and by scheduling up to seven games per week; and

"Whereas, in no other collegiate sport is there such a disparity in the playing conditions due to weather, which could be addressed by a more flexible playing schedule and a uniform starting date for all programs; and

"Whereas, a right inherent in institutional membership is the opportunity to participate in an NCAA championship, and in the last 22 years, only one member institution from a non-sunbelt state has won the NCAA Division I Baseball Championship; and

"Whereas, college baseball could become a revenue-producing sport, while not costing athletics departments additional revenue and, at the same time, remain responsive to the academic concerns identified by the Presidents Commission;

"Now, Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Association direct the governing sports committees to address the equity and feasibility of formatting a championship playing schedule in which the regional tournaments begin no earlier than the 16th weekend (defined as having both Saturdays and Sundays) after March 1; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that recommendations on this matter be forwarded by the sports committees to the Executive Committee not later than August 1, 1994."

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Brigham Young University; Kansas State University; University of Southern Mississippi; University of Notre Dame; Ohio State University; Old Dominion University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and Wichita State University.

Effective Date: Part A effective August 1, 1995; Part B effective immediately.

Rationale: This proposal would adjust the spring semester playing season so that existing academic constraints on the student-athlete would be reduced and also would establish uniform starting and ending dates for all Division I baseball programs. The legislation will minimize class time missed due to competition and allow the spring playing schedule to accommodate final examination periods. The cost savings in eliminating spring trips made by many institutions would be significant and the administrative expense in rescheduling games and traveling cost would also be reduced. It is the sponsors' contention that there will be an increase in summer school enrollment by the athletes, which, in effect, will increase their graduation rates and allow baseball players to progress at an academic rate similar to traditional students. By reducing the weather element now existing in college baseball, the proposal provides an opportunity for a true national championship tournament, thus enhancing the long-standing NCAA principle of competitive equity.

Committee Position (Executive Committee): The committee voted to oppose this proposal. The committee took the same position on this proposal at the 1993 NCAA Convention, essentially because it would require that the College World Series be played the last weekend in June or the first weekend in July, and it does not believe it is appropriate to conduct championship competition that late. Further, while the sponsors suggest that the "weather element" would be reduced by this proposal, the committee noted that the nature of virtually all outdoor championships is shaped somewhat by the weather; and that if championships competition would be conducted on a year-round basis, it does not feel this is in the best interest of the championships program or student-athletes.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 102 (NO. 2-110) CONTEST LIMITATIONS — DIVISION III BASEBALL

Intent: To specify that in Division III baseball, each date of a tournament shall be counted as one contest, provided that not more than two tournaments fall under this provision each academic year.

Bylaws: Amend 17.2.5.1, pages 221-222, as follows:
[Division III only]

"17.2.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of baseball during the institution's baseball playing season to the following number of contests (games and scrimmages), except for those contests excluded under 17.2.5.3: [17.2.5.1-(a) and 17.2.5.1-(b) unchanged.]

"17.2.5.1.1 Tournament Dates — Division III. In Division III, each date of a baseball tournament shall be counted as one contest, provided not more than two tournaments fall under this provision during an academic year."

[17.2.5.1.1, renumbered as 17.2.5.1.2, unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: This proposal would establish in Division III baseball the same tournament-date legislation currently in effect for Division III softball.

Committee Position (Division III Steering Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division III (138-108, 16 abstentions).

NO. 103 (NO. 2-111) SUMMER BASEBALL — STAFF LIMITATIONS

Intent: To permit an institution's baseball coach to perform administrative duties related to an NCAA-approved summer baseball league, provided the coach engages in no on- or off-field coaching activities that involve any contact with student-athletes from that institution.

A. Bylaws: Amend 30.13.3 by adding new 30.13.3.1, page 389, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"30.13.3.1 Institution's Baseball Coach. In a league that involves student-athletes from a coach's institution, a member institution's baseball coach may be involved only with league administrative duties (e.g., serve as a member of a league's board of directors), but shall not perform any on- or off-field coaching or supervisory responsibilities that involve contact with student-athletes from the coach's institution."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.2.8.1.4.1, page 224, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.2.8.1.4.1 Involvement of Coaching Staff. No member of the coaching staff of a Division I, II or III member institution may be involved in any capacity (e.g., coach, official, player, or league/team administrator) at any time (i.e., during the academic year, vacation periods and summer) with an outside team that involves any student-athlete with remaining eligibility from that institution's baseball team except as provided under 14.8.6 and 17.23 and 30.13.3.1."

Source: NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The NCAA currently funds and sanctions 11 summer collegiate baseball leagues. The commissioners of these leagues would like the input and support of the college baseball community in making decisions that will impact student-athletes. Since this is an official NCAA program for which the Association distributes a considerable sum of money, it is important that the welfare of the student-athletes be protected by those persons who have affiliations with NCAA schools.

Action: Part A adopted. Part B adopted.

NO. 104 (NO. 2-115) CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL

Intent: In the sport of Division I women's basketball, to permit institutions to exempt participation in the Women's Preseason National Invitation Tournament from their maximum number of basketball contests and to specify that the tournament may take place during November 15 through November 30.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.3.1, pages 225-226, as follows:
[Division I only]

"17.3.3.1 Exceptions. The following basketball contests (games or scrimmages) are permitted prior to the first contest dates specified under 17.3.3:

[17.3.3.1-(a) through 17.3.3.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) **Preseason Women's National Invitation Tournament.** For Division I women only, participation in the Women's Preseason National Invitation Tournament sponsored by the Triple Crown Women's Intercollegiate Basketball Association. The tournament shall be a 16-team, single-elimination event (with one consolation game) conducted each year during the period from November 15 through November 30. Participation in the tournament shall be limited, by institution, to once in any four-year period and, by conference, to one institution of a member conference per tournament."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.3.2, pages 227-228, as follows:
[Division I only]

"17.3.5.3.2 Additional Division I Options

"17.3.5.3.2.1 Basic Options. Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests:

[17.3.5.3.2.1-(a) through 17.3.5.3.2.1-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) **Preseason Women's National Invitation Tournament.** The games played in the Preseason Women's National Invitation Tournament."

[17.3.5.3.2.1-(d), relettered as 17.3.5.3.2.1-(e), and remainder of 17.3.5.3.2 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Southwest Conference; Brigham Young University; California State University, Fresno; University of Hawaii; University of New Mexico; San Diego State University; University of Texas at El Paso; University of Utah, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Division I men's basketball has had a Preseason National Invitation Tournament for a number of years. This opportunity, however, has not been available to Division I women's basketball. Women's intercollegiate basketball has shown significant growth in both participation and spectator interest over the past few years. This trend supports the financial viability of such an event and demonstrates the increased popularity of the sport. The event would be another step toward providing gender equity for women's athletics. The tournament will be overseen by the Triple Crown Women's Intercollegiate Basketball Association (TCWIBA). The TCWIBA is an organization comprised of Triple Crown Sports, Inc., and five individuals who are involved with the NCAA either through a member institution, a member conference or the Women's Basketball Coaches Association (WBCA). These individuals will serve for a specified term. Each Division I member conference and the WBCA will nominate representatives on a rotating basis.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The committee voted to support this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 105 (NO. 2-116) CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I BASKETBALL

Intent: To specify that, once every four years, a Division I institution located outside of Hawaii may exempt not more than one basketball contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Hawaii) or one basketball tournament (not to exceed three contests) against or under the sponsorship of an active Division II member institution located in the state of Hawaii.

Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.3.2, pages 227-228, as follows:
[Division I only]

"17.3.5.3.2 Additional Division I Options

"17.3.5.3.2.1. Basic Options. Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests:

"(a) *Hawaii* or Alaska Contests. Not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Alaska or Hawaii) or one tournament (not to exceed three contests), by a member institution located outside the area in question, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member located in Alaska or an active

Division II member institution located in Hawaii.

[17.3.5.3.2.1-(b) through 17.3.5.3.2.1-(d) and 17.3.5.3.2.2 unchanged.]

"17.3.5.3.2.3 Division II Member Institution in Hawaii Option. Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution located outside of Hawaii may exempt not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Hawaii) or one tournament (not to exceed three contests), against or under the sponsorship of an active Division II member located in Hawaii."

Source: Alcorn State University; University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Austin Peay State University; University of Cincinnati; DePaul University; University of Evansville; Indiana University, Bloomington; Louisiana State University; University of Louisville; Memphis State University; University of Oklahoma, and Santa Clara University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The Maui Invitational has made great strides in serving the overall interests of intercollegiate basketball by providing a unique competitive and educational experience for its participants and followers. Since its inception in 1984, its benefits have been afforded to nearly 1,000 student-athletes representing 47 different institutions from 27 different states and 20 different conferences. Adoption of an NCAA Convention proposal last year will permit the return of the tournament to the Thanksgiving holiday period, minimizing loss of class time and conflict with final examination periods while preserving conference and institutional in-season scheduling practices and objectives, particularly scheduling flexibility. This proposal will permit even greater scheduling flexibility and increased opportunities for institutions to participate in the tournament. This widespread participation has been a tournament objective since its inception. As noted in the University of Hawaii's successful presentation of comparable legislation at last year's Convention, "To maintain a viable athletics program, special scheduling considerations are essential" because almost all NCAA member institutions are located 2,500 miles away. Approval of this proposal would be consistent with the approval granted Hawaii by the 1993 Convention.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The committee voted to support this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 106 (NO. 2-117) CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I BASKETBALL

Intent: To permit Division I institutions, once every 12 years, to exempt participation in the Great Alaska Shootout from their maximum number of basketball contests.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.3.2.1, pages 227-228, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.3.5.3.2.1 Basic Options. Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests:

"(a) Hawaii or Alaska Contests (Other Than Great Alaska Shootout). Not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Alaska or Hawaii) or one tournament (not to exceed three contests) other than the Great Alaska Shootout, by a member institution located outside the area in question, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member located in Alaska or an active Division II member institution located in Hawaii;"

[Remainder of 17.3.5.3.2.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5 by adding new 17.3.5.5, page 228, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.3.5.5 Once-In-Twelve-Years Exemption — Great Alaska Shootout. Not more than once every 12 years, a Division I member institution located outside Alaska may exempt participation in the Great Alaska Shootout (not to exceed three contests)."

Source: College of Charleston; Clemson University; Jackson State University; University of New Mexico; University of North Carolina, Greensboro; University of Notre Dame; University of Rhode Island; St. Bonaventure University; Weber State University, and University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Begun in 1978 by the host institution, the University of Alaska Anchorage, the Great Alaska Shootout has afforded nearly 1,600 student-athletes representing 105 Division I institutions the unique, educational, once-in-a-lifetime opportunity of visiting Alaska. Because of Anchorage's location (1,500 miles from the nearest Division I institution) and winter climate, exemptions for games played in the tournament are critical to its survival. In order to minimize missed class time for participating student-athletes, the tournament is held over the Thanksgiving weekend. The tournament has had a significant economic impact on Anchorage and Alaska. More importantly, however, revenues from the tournament have gone to support both men's and women's athletics programs at Alaska Anchorage and have helped the institution to remain a viable NCAA member. This legislation would help clear up the confusion regarding the current exemptions in men's basketball and ensure representation in the tournament from all recognized Division I conferences over a 12-year period.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The committee voted to support this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 107 (NO. 2-105) DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — TRADITIONAL AND NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT

Intent: To specify that a Division III institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the sports of golf and tennis in the fall and schedules more than 50 percent of its contests during the nontraditional segment may utilize the preseason practice and first-date-of-competition regulations applicable to the traditional segment in the sports of golf and tennis.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.10 by adding a new 17.1.10.4, page 221, as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.1.10.4 Conducting More Than 50 Percent of Schedule in Golf and Tennis During Nontraditional Segment — Division III. A member institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall and that schedules more than 50 percent of its contests or dates of competition (including the conference championship) in the nontraditional segment may elect to utilize the preseason practice and first-date-of-competition regulations applicable to the traditional segment as set forth in 17.8.2, 17.17.2 and 17.17.3."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee) and all members of the Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic and Wisconsin State University Conferences.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will ensure that participation opportunities for student-athletes in golf and tennis will not be restricted by staffing and facility limitations that could occur if the traditional segment was held in the spring. Unpredictable weather conditions preclude many institutions from conducting their traditional segment in the spring. An earlier fall start date would allow additional time to complete a season in areas of the country plagued by unpredictable weather conditions.

Committee Position (Division III Steering Committee): The committee recommended that the Council cosponsor this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division III.

NO. 108 (NO. 2-106) DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Intent: In Division III, to permit an institution to participate in an unlimited number of exhibition scrimmages on one date during

the preseason practice period in the traditional segment in the sports of cross country, field hockey, soccer and women's volleyball. [Note: The following proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

Bylaws: Amend 17.____.3, pages 230-297, for the sports of cross country, field hockey, soccer and women's volleyball, by amending the respective sections entitled "First Contest or Date of Competition — Traditional Segment", as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.____.3 First Contest or Date of Competition. A member institution shall not engage in its first contest or date of competition (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in each segment prior to the following dates:

"17.____.3.1 Traditional Segment.

[17.____.3.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III — August 24, or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first, **except that an unlimited number of exhibition scrimmages may be conducted on one date during the preseason practice period (see 17.____.2), which shall count as one date of competition in the institution's maximum limitation on contests or dates of competition.**"

[Remainder of 17.____.3 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the North Coast Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: In light of recent cutbacks in numbers of contests, permitting an institution to have more than one scrimmage, on one date, in the sports of cross country, field hockey, soccer and women's volleyball is a cost-effective way to prepare teams for the regular season. In some cases (e.g., field hockey), it may provide valuable opportunities to train or certify game officials in a cost-effective manner.

Committee Position (Division III Steering Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal and recommended that the sponsors of this proposal and Proposal No. 109 (2-118) attempt to identify a mutually acceptable proposal and amend as appropriate. [Note: The sponsors subsequently compromised by amending each proposal.]

Action: Adopted by Division III.

NO. 109 (NO. 2-118) DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Intent: In the sports of Division III cross country, field hockey, soccer and women's volleyball, to permit 16 preseason practice opportunities prior to the first contest in the traditional segment,

or prior to September 1, whichever is later; to establish September 1 as the first date of competition in the traditional and non-traditional segments for all sports other than football, basketball and ice hockey, and to continue to permit exhibition scrimmages to be conducted during the preseason practice period in the traditional segment. [Note: The following proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

- A. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.2, pages 231-304, for Cross Country, Field Hockey, Soccer and Women's Volleyball by amending the respective sections entitled "Preseason Practice" as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in each segment prior to the following dates:

"17.2.1 Traditional Segment

[17.2.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III—August 24 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first. **The date that permits a maximum of 16 practice opportunities (see 17.02.13) prior to the first scheduled intercollegiate game or prior to September 1, whichever is later.**"

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.3, pages 221-304, for all sports other than football, basketball and ice hockey by amending the respective sections entitled "First Date of Competition" as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.3 First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in each segment prior to the following dates:

"17.3.1 Traditional Segment

[17.3.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III—August 24 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first. **September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday, except that exhibition scrimmages may be conducted during the preseason practice period (see 17.2).**

"17.3.2 Nontraditional Segment

[17.3.2-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III—September 1 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first."

Source: All members of the University Athletic Association.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Given the variation in academic calendars, many Division III institutions currently begin preseason practice prior to

the start of classes or their institutional orientation periods. At the same time, other institutions can conduct most or all of their preseason practice prior to the start of classes or institutional orientation periods. Allowing fall sports to begin preseason practice on dates determined by counting back from the first intercollegiate contest will provide all institutions and all sports with equitable opportunities to condition and prepare their student-athletes for their respective sport seasons. It also will enable institutions to provide preseason practice opportunities during a period that allows both new students and returning students to adjust to campus life before the demands of orientation programs and classes begin. Adjusting the first dates of competition to September 1 in concert with allowing 16 preseason practice opportunities facilitates the provision of equitable opportunities to Division III student-athletes in a manner which also takes into account concerns about cost containment during the fall preseason.

Committee Position (Division III Steering Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal and recommended that the sponsors of this proposal and Proposal No. 108 (2-106) attempt to identify a mutually acceptable proposal as appropriate. [Note: The sponsors subsequently compromised by amending each proposal.]

Action: Adopted by Division III (143-128, three abstentions); motion to reconsider defeated (118-149, two abstentions).

NO. 110 (NO. 2-119) DATES OF COMPETITION — DIVISION III

Intent: To specify that a Division III institution that sponsors men's or women's cross country but does not sponsor indoor or outdoor track and field shall limit its total cross country playing season to nine dates of competition during the traditional segment and three dates during the nontraditional segment

Bylaws: Amend 17.4.5.1 and 17.4.5.2, page 232, as follows:
[Division III only]

"17.4.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of cross country during the institution's cross country playing season to the following number of dates of competition (games and scrimmages), except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.4.5.3:

[17.4.5.1-(a) and 17.4.5.1-(b) unchanged.]

"17.4.5.1.1 Exception — Cross Country Without Indoor or Outdoor Track and Field. A Division I or, II or III institution that sponsors men's or women's cross country but does not sponsor indoor or outdoor track and field shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition during the cross country playing season to seven dates of competition in Divisions I and II and nine dates of competition in Divi-

sion III during the traditional segment and five dates of competition in Divisions I and II and three dates of competition in Division III during the nontraditional segment.

[17.4.5.1.2 unchanged.]

"17.4.5.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in the following number of cross country dates of competition (this limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

[17.4.5.2-(a) and 17.4.5.2-(b) unchanged.]

"17.4.5.2.1 Exception — Cross Country Without Indoor or Outdoor Track and Field. An individual student-athlete who attends a Division I or Division II or Division III member institution that sponsors men's or women's cross country but does not sponsor indoor or outdoor track and field may participate during each academic year in seven dates of competition in Divisions I and II and nine dates of competition in Division III during the traditional segment in cross country and five dates of competition in Divisions I and II and three dates of competition in Division III during the nontraditional segment."

Source: State University of New York at Binghamton, State University College at Brockport, State University College at Buffalo, State University College at Cortland, State University College at Fredonia, State University College at Geneseo, State University College at New Paltz, State University College at Oneonta, State University College at Oswego, and State University College at Plattsburgh.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Due to the magnitude of recent restructuring legislation, some details still require fine-tuning. Currently, those institutions that sponsor the sport of cross country, but do not sponsor indoor or outdoor track and field, are limited to nine dates of competition in the traditional segment but are permitted no dates of competition in the nontraditional segment. Therefore, student-athletes with an interest in competitive distance running are not permitted to compete while representing their institutions during the nontraditional segment, as is the case in other sports. Currently, institutions cannot meet the competitive needs of those student-athletes. This proposal establishes the same guidelines and opportunities for a nontraditional season in the sport of cross country. It is consistent with the guidelines and opportunities in other sports and is consistent with the competitive dates permitted in both Divisions I and II as amended at the 1993 NCAA Convention.

Committee Position (Division III Steering Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division III (137-111, 20 abstentions).

NO. 111 (NO. 2-142) MULTIDIVISION CLASSIFICATION

Intent: To permit a Division III institution that has a sport classified in Division I to apply the Division I playing and practice season regulations of Bylaw 17 in that sport.

Bylaws: Amend 20.6.1.2, page 329, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"20.6.1.2 Division III Application. A Division III member institution that has a sport classified in Division I must apply the rules of both divisions, or the more stringent rule if both divisions have a rule concerning the same issue **except that in either instance, the Division III institution may apply the Division I playing and practice season regulations of Bylaw 17 in the Division I sport.**"

Source: Brown University, Clarkson University, Colgate University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, Princeton University, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, St. Lawrence University, Union College (New York), University of Vermont and Yale University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: A Division III member institution that elects to classify one of its sports in Division I understands that it does so at significant disadvantage to itself in the areas of financial aid, recruiting and eligibility, inasmuch as it must adhere to the more restrictive rules of Division I or III in those and other areas. It is appropriate, therefore, that the institution be permitted, at a minimum, to practice and compete on a level playing field with its Division I opponents in that sport by playing the same number of contests and scheduling its playing and practice seasons on a par with those opponents.

Committee Position (Divisions I, II and III Steering Committees): The Divisions I and III Steering Committees voted to support this proposal. The Division II Steering Committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 112 (NO. 2-124) SPRING FOOTBALL PRACTICE — DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA

Intent: In Division I, to permit spring football practice to be held on Sundays.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.6, page 246, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]
"17.7.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football

is prohibited, except for the following:

"(a) Spring Practice — Division I. In Division I, 15 postseason practice sessions [including intrasquad scrimmages and the spring game permitted in 17.7.5.2-(a)] are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 29 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar and days during which the institution is closed due to inclement weather, with no practices permitted on Sundays. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 10 of the 15 sessions may involve contact. The amount of time that a student-athlete may be involved in such postseason countable athletically related activities shall be limited to a maximum of 20 hours per week."

[Remainder of 17.7.6 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: With the current regulations on spring practice, the number of days are limited and a day off is required. Thus, the old rule of not permitting practice on Sunday is out of date. Practicing on Sunday will permit an institution to use one less class day for practice, thus enabling a class day to be the required day off. In summary, this proposal allows for institutions to decide the day off that best fits their programs and academic schedules.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The committee voted to support this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I-A and I-AA.

NO. 113 (NO. 2-125) SPRING FOOTBALL PRACTICE — DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA

Intent: To confirm that Division I institutions have the discretion to determine the practice activities that may occur during spring football noncontact sessions, provided no football gear or protective equipment other than headgear, shoes, pants and porous light-weight jerseys are worn by student-athletes, and to permit student-athletes to wear shoulder pads during those activities.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.6, page 246, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"17.7.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football is prohibited, except for the following:

"(a) Spring Practice — Division I. In Division I, 15 postseason practice sessions [including intrasquad scrimmages and the spring game permitted in 17.7.5.2-(a)] are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 29 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days offi-

cially announced on the institution's calendar and days during which the institution is closed due to inclement weather, with no practices permitted on Sundays. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 10 of the 15 sessions may involve contact. **An institution has the discretion to determine the practice activities that may occur during noncontact sessions (e.g., use of blocking dummies), provided no football gear or protective equipment other than head gear, shoulder pads, shoes, pants, and porous light-weight jerseys are worn by the involved student-athletes.** The amount of time that a student-athlete may be involved in such postseason countable athletically related activities shall be limited to a maximum of 20 hours per week;"

[Remainder of 17.7.6 unchanged.]

Source: Auburn University; Brigham Young University; University of Cincinnati; Colorado State University; East Carolina University; University of Hawaii; University of Houston; Memphis State University; Mississippi State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Syracuse University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas at El Paso; Texas A&M University; U.S. Military Academy; West Virginia University, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: A current Council-approved interpretation permits an institution to utilize blocking dummies during the noncontact days of spring football practice. In the interest of safety, the use of shoulder pads during this period would minimize injuries.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The committee voted to support this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I-A and I-AA.

NO. 114 (NO. 2-123) CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION II FOOTBALL

Intent: To exempt participation in a Division II conference-sponsored postseason tournament from the maximum number of football contests.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.5.2, pages 244-246, as follows:

[Division II football only]

"17.7.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of football contests shall exclude the following:

[17.7.5.2-(a) through 17.7.5.2-(e) unchanged.]

"(f) **Division II Conference Tournament. In Division II, a conference-sponsored postseason tournament (i.e., one between teams that are not identified until the**

end of the preceding regular season nor selected until after teams for the Division II Football Championship have been named), not to exceed one contest for any member institution;"

[17.7.5.2-(f) through 17.7.5.2-(n), relettered as 17.7.5.2-(g) through 17.7.5.2-(o), unchanged.]

Source: Assumption College, Bentley College, Gannon University, Long Island University/C. W. Post Campus, University of Massachusetts at Lowell, Mercyhurst College, Pace University, Sacred Heart University and Stonehill College.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Some members of Division II football are restricted from NCAA postseason participation by conference policy, while other members of Division II, primarily those that sponsor nonscholarship football programs, are faced with the reality that their level of competition essentially rules them out of consideration for NCAA postseason competition. These institutions, therefore, desire the opportunity to participate in a postseason conference-sponsored championship (not to exceed one contest) without including that contest in the maximum number of permissible football contests. Such a contest would be the only postseason opportunity for that institution's football team.

Committee Position (Division II Steering Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division II (72-58, four abstentions).

NO. 115 (NO. 2-126) SPRING FOOTBALL PRACTICE — DIVISION II

Intent: To increase from 21 to 29 the consecutive calendar days during which the 15 spring football practice sessions must be completed in Division II.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.6, page 246, as follows:

[Division II football only]

"17.7.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football is prohibited, except for the following:

[17.7.6-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Spring Practice — Division II. In Division II, 15 postseason practice sessions [including intrasquad scrimmages and the spring game permitted in 17.7.5.2-(a)] are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 21 29 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar and days during which the institution is closed due to inclement weather, with no practices permitted on Sundays. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic

classes are in session. Only 10 of the 15 sessions may involve contact. A student-athlete's participation in countable athletically related activities (see 17.02.1.1) during the spring practice period shall be limited to a maximum of four hours per day and 20 hours per week;"

[Remainder of 17.7.6 unchanged.]

Source: Augustana College (South Dakota), University of Nebraska at Kearney, University of North Alabama, University of North Dakota, North Dakota State University, Northwest Missouri State University, Pittsburg State University, University of South Dakota and Texas A&M University, Kingsville.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The present legislation related to spring football practice is very restrictive and has some inherent difficulties. Practice is not allowed on Sundays, yet Sundays are counted as one of the consecutive calendar days. This equates to 18 actual days from which a coaching staff may select practice days. Student-athletes are challenged physically to practice no less than five days in a given week, which is more demanding than a week during the fall season. Inclement spring weather can cause coaches to cancel practices for the health and safety of student-athletes. With one or two weather-related cancellations, student-athletes could be practicing six consecutive days. This is too demanding and invites injury. By providing more practice opportunities, institutions will have more flexibility to adjust their practice schedules around academic priorities. Days on which practice is not conducted could fall on class and/or test days. This also will keep the number of participants in spring practice high, thereby promoting consistent repetition levels and minimizing the potential for injury. Dual-sport athletes also should benefit. In short, the addition of eight days to the spring-practice window demonstrates enhanced concern for the health, safety and academic success of student-athletes.

Committee Position (Division II Steering Committee): The committee voted to oppose this proposal, inasmuch as it believes that it is contrary to the reform movement having to do with reducing the amount of time that student-athletes are required to spend on athletically related activities.

Action: Adopted by Division II (71-58, six abstentions).

NO. 116 (NO. 2-127) SPRING FOOTBALL PRACTICE — DIVISION II

Intent: To increase from 21 to 24 the consecutive calendar days during which the 15 spring football practice sessions must be completed in Division II.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.6, page 246, as follows:
[Division II football only]

"17.7.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football is prohibited, except for the following:

[17.7.6-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Spring Practice — Division II. In Division II, 15 postseason practice sessions [including intrasquad scrimmages and the spring game permitted in 17.7.5.2-(a)] are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 21 24 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar and days during which the institution is closed due to inclement weather, with no practices permitted on Sundays. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 10 of the 15 sessions may involve contact. A student-athlete's participation in countable athletically related activities (see 17.02.1.1) during the spring practice period shall be limited to a maximum of four hours per day and 20 hours per week."

[Remainder of 17.7.6 unchanged.]

Source: Augustana College (South Dakota); Indiana University of Pennsylvania; Mankato State University; University of Nebraska, Omaha; University of North Alabama; University of North Dakota; North Dakota State University; Pittsburg State University; South Dakota State University, and Texas A&M University, Kingsville.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The present legislation related to spring football practice is very restrictive and has some inherent difficulties. Practice is not allowed on Sundays, yet Sundays are counted as one of the consecutive calendar days. This equates to 18 actual days from which a coaching staff may select practice days. Student-athletes are challenged physically to practice no less than five days in a given week, which is more demanding than a week during the fall season. Inclement spring weather can cause coaches to cancel practices for the health and safety of student-athletes. With one or two weather-related cancellations, student-athletes could be practicing six consecutive days. This is too demanding and invites injury. By providing more practice opportunities, institutions will have more flexibility to adjust their practice schedules around academic priorities. Days on which practice is not conducted could fall on class and/or test days. This also will keep the number of participants in spring practice high, thereby promoting consistent repetition levels and minimizing the potential for injury. Dual-sport athletes also should benefit. In short, the addition of three days to the spring-practice window demonstrates enhanced concern for the health, safety and academic success of student-athletes.

Committee Position (Division II Steering Committee): The committee voted to oppose this proposal, inasmuch as it believes

that it is contrary to the reform movement having to do with reducing the amount of time that student-athletes are required to spend on athletically related activities.

Action: Moot.

NO. 117 (NO. 2-128) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — GOLF

Intent: In the sport of golf, to change the first date of practice in the nontraditional segment to September 7 or the first date of classes, whichever occurs earlier, and to change the first date of competition in both the traditional and nontraditional segments to the first Saturday in September.

Bylaws: Amend 17.8.2, pages 248-249, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.8.2 Preseason Practice and First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in golf or engage in its first date of competition (meet or practice meet) with outside competition in each segment in golf prior to the following dates:

"17.8.2.1 Preseason Practice

[17.8.2.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.8.2.1.2 Nontraditional Segment

"(a) Divisions I and II — September 7 or the first date of classes, whichever occurs earlier.

[Remainder of 17.8.2.1 unchanged.]

"17.8.2.2 First Date of Competition

"17.8.2.2.1 Traditional Segment

"(a) Divisions I and II — September 7 The first Saturday in September.

[17.8.2.2.1-(b) unchanged.]

"17.8.2.2.2 Nontraditional Segment

"(a) Divisions I and II — September 7 The first Saturday in September."

[Remainder of 17.8.2.2 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will allow institutions in regions with inclement weather conditions to begin fall competition earlier. In addition, the sports of cross country, field hockey, soccer and water polo currently are permitted to begin competition the first Saturday in September.

Committee Position (Divisions I and II Steering Committees): The Divisions I and II Steering Committees voted to support this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

NO. 118 (NO. 2-129) GOLF — COLLEGE-AM FUND-RAISER

Intent: In Division I, to permit a "college-am" fund-raiser to be excluded from the three-day tournament limitation in the sport of golf, provided it is conducted the day prior to a three-day tournament and no practice round is played prior to the day of the "college-am."

Bylaws: Amend 17.8.4.1.1, page 250, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.8.4.1.1 Tournament Limitations. No tournament *(including those involving 'college-am' fund-raisers)* shall exceed three days. A 'college-am' fund-raiser may be excluded from this limitation, provided the event is held the day prior to a three-day tournament and no practice round is played prior to the day of the 'college-am.'"

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: It is necessary at this time of extreme budget consciousness to have ways to pay for intercollegiate golf tournaments. This proposal makes the "college-am" tournament consistent with legislation exempting this event under 17.8.4.2-(o). Because the "college-am" must take the place of the practice round for those participating, no additional class time will be missed.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The Division I Steering Committee voted to support this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 119 (NO. 2-130) MAXIMUM DATES OF COMPETITION — TENNIS

Intent: In Division I, to specify that tournaments in which men's tennis programs participate under the format and rules of Team Tennis, involving both male and female participants, shall count as no more than two dates of competition, and to specify that competition by individual participants in singles/doubles tournaments conducted over more than one day under the rules and format of Team Tennis shall count as two dates of competition.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.17.5.1 by adding new 17.17.5.1 3, page 284, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.17.5.1.3 Men's Team Participating in Tournament Played Under the Team Tennis Format — Institutional. A tournament, involving both male and female participants, played under the rules and format of Team Tennis, shall count as no more than two dates of competition for the men's team, regardless of the actual number of days during which competition takes place."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.17.5.1.4, by adding new 17.17.5.1.4.2, page 284, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.17.5.1.4.2 Individual Singles or Doubles Team Tennis Tournament Limitations — Student-Athlete. A tournament conducted over more than one day, under the rules and format of Team Tennis, shall count as two dates of competition for the participating individuals, regardless of the actual number of days during which tournament competition takes place."

Source: All members of the Big Sky Conference

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Tournaments played under the Team Tennis format do not require the same number of male or female participants that are required in a regular team tournament, since only one pro set is played by each player. The players actually are participating for a shorter period of time than they would be during an individual tournament using regular scoring.

Committee Position (Division I Steering Committee): The Division I Steering Committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Parts A and B adopted by Division I.

Awards/Expenses/Amateurism

NO. 120 (NO. 2-31) AMATEURISM — BASKETBALL DRAFT

Intent: To permit a student-athlete in the sport of basketball to enter a professional league's draft without jeopardizing eligibility in that sport, provided the student-athlete declares his or her intention to resume intercollegiate basketball participation within 30 days after the draft.

Bylaws: Amend 12.2.4.2 by adding new 12.2.4.2.1, page 67, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.2.4.2.1 Exception — Professional Basketball Draft. A student-athlete in the sport of basketball may enter a professional league's draft one time during his or her collegiate career without jeopardizing eligibility in that sport, provided the student-athlete declares his or her intention to resume intercollegiate participation within 30 days after the draft."

Source: NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: In a survey of Division I basketball coaches conducted earlier this year, 76 percent of the respondents supported this concept. The Professional Sports Liaison Committee believes

that NCAA regulations should not inhibit a basketball student-athlete's opportunity to investigate professional sports opportunities in the same way that other college students are not prohibited from stating their interest in reviewing professional employment options from sources outside the institution. Currently, a student-athlete loses amateur status in basketball when the student-athlete asks to be placed on a professional basketball league's draft list. In the sports of baseball and ice hockey, however, a player is drafted without his consent. Accordingly, such a student-athlete already will have an indication of his market value (by learning of his place in the draft) without jeopardizing his eligibility. In the sport of basketball, a student-athlete must provide written consent to be drafted by a National Basketball Association team; however, such a student-athlete renders himself or herself immediately ineligible through this activity. This proposal would provide to basketball student-athletes an opportunity similar to that available to student-athletes in the sports of ice hockey and baseball. It should be noted that this proposal does not allow a student-athlete to retain an agent without jeopardizing his or her eligibility, nor does it change current legislation related to tryouts with professional teams

Action: Adopted.

NO. 121 (NO. 2-33) PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES — PLAYER/TRADING CARDS

Intent: To prohibit the sale of player/trading cards that bear the names or pictures of student-athletes with remaining eligibility as a permissible promotional activity.

- A. Bylaws:** Amend 12.5.1.1 by adding new 12.5.1.1.2, page 71, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.5.1.1.2 Player/Trading Cards. A member institution or recognized entity thereof (e.g., fraternity, sorority or student government organization), a member conference or a noninstitutional charitable, educational or nonprofit agency may distribute but may not sell player/trading cards that bear a student-athlete's name or picture to support its charitable or educational activities or to support activities considered incidental to the student-athlete's participation in intercollegiate athletics."

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 12.5.1.11.1, page 72, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.5.1.11 Olympic, Pan American and World University Games. A student-athlete's name or picture may be used to promote Olympic, Pan American or World University Games as specified in this section.

"12.5.1.11.1 Sale and Distribution of Promotional Items. Promotional items (e.g., playing cards, posters, postcards, film,

videotapes) bearing the name or picture of a student-athlete and related to these events may be sold or distributed by the national or international sports governing body sponsoring these events or its designated third-party distributors. **It is not permissible for such organizations to sell player/trading cards that bear a student-athlete's name or picture.** Promotional items may include a corporate sponsor's trademark or logo but not a reproduction of the product with which the business is associated. The name or picture of the student-athlete may not be utilized by the distribution company or retail store on any advertisement to promote the sale or distribution of the commercial item."

[Remainder of 12.5.1.11.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Communications Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Concern has been expressed regarding entities that are selling trading cards that contain the names or pictures of student-athletes. There is a sense that the sale of such cards blurs the line between college and professional athletics and creates an undesirable image of intercollegiate athletics. This proposal will eliminate such concerns by precluding all entities (e.g., institutions; conferences; charitable, educational and nonprofit organizations, and national or international sports governing bodies) from selling player/trading cards that bear the names or pictures of student-athletes with remaining eligibility. It will remain permissible for such entities to distribute such cards free of charge for positive purposes (e.g., drug education).

Action: Adopted.

NO. 122 (NO. 2-29) PAYMENT FOR COMMERCIAL ADVERTISEMENTS

Intent: To permit an individual to receive payment for the display of athletics skill in a commercial advertisement prior to collegiate enrollment, provided the U.S. Olympic Committee or appropriate national governing body approves of the content and the production of the advertisement, and provided the funds are forwarded to the U.S. Olympic Committee or the applicable national governing body and are not earmarked for the individual.

Bylaws: Amend 12.5.1 by adding new 12.5.1.2, page 71, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.5.1.2 Using Athletics Skill in Advertisement Prior to Collegiate Enrollment. Prior to initial, full-time collegiate enrollment, an individual may receive payment for the display of athletics skill in a commercial advertisement, provided:

- "(a) The individual receives prior approval to appear in the advertisement from the U.S. Olympic Committee or the applicable national governing body;
- "(b) The U.S. Olympic Committee or national governing body approves of the content and the production of the advertisement;
- "(c) The individual forwards the payment to the U.S. Olympic Committee or national governing body for the general use of the organization(s), and
- "(d) The funds are not earmarked for the individual."

[12.5.1.2 through 12.5.1.11 renumbered as 12.5.1.3 through 12.5.1.12, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Under current NCAA legislation, an individual may not receive payment for utilizing athletics skill in a commercial advertisement without jeopardizing his or her amateur status. The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee believes that the limited exception proposed in this legislation will serve to support the Olympics without compromising the intent of the Association's amateurism regulations.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 123 (NO. 2-30) TRAVEL EXPENSES TO OLYMPIC GAMES

Intent: To permit the spouse, parents, legal guardians or other relatives of an individual who will participate in the Olympic Games to receive travel expenses to attend the Games from a commercial company or from members of the local community without jeopardizing the individual's intercollegiate athletics eligibility.

- A. **Bylaws:** Amend 12.1.2 by adding new 12.1.2.6, page 65, as follows:
[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.1.2.6 Exception for Family Travel to Olympic Games. A commercial company (other than a professional sports organization) or members of the local community may provide actual and necessary expenses for an individual's spouse, parents, legal guardians or other relatives to attend the Olympic Games in which the individual will participate."

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 16.6.1 by adding new 16.6.1.4, page 199, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.6.1.4 Family Travel to Olympic Games. A commercial company (other than a professional sports organization) or members of the local community may provide actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete's spouse,

parents, legal guardians or other relatives to attend the Olympic Games in which the student-athlete will participate."

Source: NCAA Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: A current interpretation permits parents of athletes to receive travel expenses to attend the Olympic Games from a commercial sponsor if the sponsor agrees to provide such expenses to all athletes' parents attending the Games. The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee believes that this interpretation is too restrictive. The Olympic Games are a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity deserving of a special exception to the Association's amateurism principles. Such a benefit should be deemed incidental to the athlete's participation in the games.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 124 (NO. 2-28) DEVELOPMENTAL TRAINING EXPENSES

Intent: To permit an individual to receive actual and necessary expenses for developmental training programs conducted at any time during the year, provided the individual misses no class time and the program does not conflict with the individual's participation in institutional competition.

Bylaws: Amend 12.1.2.5, page 65, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.1.2.5 Exception for Developmental Training Programs. An individual may receive actual and necessary expenses for developmental training programs conducted and supervised at any time of the year by the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC) or the appropriate national governing body (NGB) (or, for foreign student-athletes, the equivalent organization of that nation), even if the programs include no competition, provided the programs are conducted during the summer or any other vacation period published in the institution's official catalog the individual misses no class time and the activity program does not conflict with dates of institutional competition."

Source: NCAA Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The U.S. Olympic Committee and USA Track and Field have indicated that many developmental training programs are conducted on weekends throughout the year. It is important that the membership continue to be responsive to Olympic organizations when the Association's rules can be changed to assist those organizations without creating the potential for abuse. This proposal contains academic safeguards by specifying that no class time or dates of institutional competition may be missed by individuals who participate in these training programs.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 125 (NO. 2-32) PROFESSIONAL SPORTS
COUNSELING PANEL**

Intent: To prohibit an institution's chief executive officer from appointing to an institution's professional sports counseling panel any individual who is a sports agent.

Bylaws: Amend 12.3.4.2, pages 68-69 as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.3.4.2 Composition. No more than one panel member may be an athletics department staff member. All other panel members must be selected by the institution from among its full-time employees employed outside the athletics department. **No institutional staff member who is a sports agent may be a member of the panel.** All panel members shall be identified to the NCAA national office."

Source: NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately

Rationale: NCAA legislation currently requires that panel members must be selected by the institution from among its full-time employees. No legislative provision specifically prohibits a sports agent, who also is a full-time employee at the institution, from serving on that institution's professional sports counseling panel. It is a conflict of interest for an individual who is a full-time employee of an institution, but who also is a sports agent, to serve on the institution's panel. An institution's panel still would be permitted to utilize such an individual's expertise, inasmuch as a panel is permitted to work with outside consultants to provide guidance to its student-athletes regarding professional sports opportunities.

Action: Adopted

NO. 126 (NO. 2-91) TRAINING-TABLE MEALS

Note: The NCAA Council has submitted the following proposal for decision by the Division I membership. While the Council has not taken a position on the proposal, it believes the membership should have the opportunity to consider and vote on the proposal.

Intent: To preclude Division I institutions from providing training-table meals to student-athletes outside the playing season.

A. Bylaws: Amend 16.5.1, page 198, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A and all other Division I members, divided vote]

"16.5.1 Permissible. Identified housing and meal benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics that may be financed by the institution are.

[16.5.1-(a) and 16.5.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Training-Table Meals — Division I. In Division I, an institu-

tion may provide only one training-table meal per day to a student-athlete during the *academic year* **playing and practice season (including spring football practice) in the student's sport** on those days when regular institutional dining facilities are open;"

[Remainder of 16.5.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 16.5.2, page 199, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A and all other Division I members, divided vote]

"16.5.2 Nonpermissible

[16.5.2.1 and 16.5.2.2 unchanged.]

"16.5.2.3 Training-Table Meals. An institution may not provide training-table meals to a student-athlete outside the playing and practice season in the student's sport."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Effective Date: August 1, 1996.

Rationale: Although questions have been raised about whether this proposal will actually reduce costs or merely shift them from one facility to another, the special committee believes that on many campuses this proposal will create real savings.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A (56-56, two abstentions); motion to reconsider defeated. Not moved in Division I other than I-A.

NO. 127 (NO. 2-95) PREGAME HOUSING

Note: The NCAA Council has submitted the following proposal for decision by the Divisions I and III membership. While the Council has not taken a position on the proposal, it believes the membership should have the opportunity to consider and vote on the proposal.

Intent: To eliminate special housing for student-athletes prior to regular-season home competition.

Bylaws: Amend 16.8.2 by adding new 16.8.2.5, page 203, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A, all other Division I members and Division III, divided vote]

"16.8.2.5 Pregame Housing. An institution may not provide on- or off-campus housing that is separate from the student-athlete's regular housing prior to a regular-season home contest in any sport on those days when institutional dormitories are open."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: This proposal is intended to contain housing costs incidental to competition by requiring that institutions house stu-

dent-athletes on campus whenever possible. It will preclude the housing of student-athletes off campus or in other institutional facilities when residence halls are open. The practice of making special arrangements to house teams off campus in conjunction with home contests is an unnecessary expense.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A. Not moved in Division I other than I-A. Adopted by Division III; motion to reconsider defeated.

NO. 128 (NO. 2-90) CLEARINGHOUSE FEE — NONRECRUITED STUDENT-ATHLETE

Intent: To permit an institution to pay the fee charged by the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse to establish the initial-eligibility status of a nonrecruited student-athlete.

Bylaws: Amend 16.3.2, page 197, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"16.3.2 Permissible. Academic and other support services that may be financed by an institution are:

[16.3.2-(a) through 16.3.2-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) Fees charged by the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse to establish the initial-eligibility status of a nonrecruited student-athlete (per 13.02.9)."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee to Oversee Implementation of the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: This legislation will expedite the clearinghouse's certification of the initial-eligibility status of true "walk-ons" in a timely manner, without creating a recruiting advantage for member institutions.

Action: Defeated by Division I (paddle vote); and Division II (77-128, two abstentions).

NO. 129 (NO. 2-89) COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS

Intent: To eliminate the restrictions on those individuals who may be designated by a student-athlete to receive complimentary admissions.

Bylaws: Amend 16.2.1.2, page 196, as follows:
[Division I only]

"16.2.1.2 Division I Regulations. Complimentary admissions shall be provided only through a pass list for individuals designated by the student-athlete. No more than one of the four complimentary admissions in the student-athlete's sport may be provided to anyone other than family members, relatives or fellow students (i.e., a 'wild-card' admission). 'Hard tickets' shall not be issued. The institution shall be responsible for this administrative procedure, and the student-athlete's eligibility shall be affected by involvement in action contrary to the provisions of 16.2.1.1 and 16.2.2.1 (i.e., receipt of more than the per-

missible four complimentary admissions or the sale or exchange of a complimentary admission for any item of value)."

[16.2.1.2.1 and 16.2.1.2.2 deleted, 16.2.1.2.3 and 16.2.1.2.4 renumbered as 16.2.1.2.1 and 16.2.1.2.2, unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Legislation concerning complimentary admissions originally was intended to ensure that student-athletes did not receive an extra benefit as a result of the sale or exchange of a complimentary admission for anything of value. Current restrictions placed on who may receive a student-athlete's complimentary admissions work an administrative and financial hardship on the institution's ticket office that far exceeds any possible benefit. Adoption of this proposal would eliminate the need for the institution to determine whether an individual receiving a complimentary admission is related to the student-athlete and will permit the institution to concentrate on the real issue; namely, whether the student-athlete received anything of value for the complimentary admission.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division I; motion to reconsider defeated (156-167, four abstentions).

NO. 130 (NO. 2-92) TRAVEL EXPENSES — EXCEPTION

Intent: To eliminate the travel-expense exception for travel following regular-season competition that occurs during a vacation period.

A. Bylaws: Amend 16.7.2.1, page 200, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.7.2.1 Exceptions. The time limitations related to the provisions of travel expenses do not apply in the following circumstances:

[16.7.2.1-(a) and 16.7.2.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Travel prior to and following regular-season competition that takes place during the institution's official vacation period during the academic year;"

[Remainder of 16.7.2.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 16.8.1.2.1.1, pages 201-202, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.8.1.2.1.1 Exceptions. These travel-expense restrictions do not apply in the following circumstances:

[16.8.1.2.1.1-(a) and 16.8.1.2.1.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Travel prior to and following regular-season competition that takes place during the institution's official vacation period during the academic year;"

[Remainder of 16.8.1.2.1.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The adoption of this proposal will eliminate the distinction between travel-expense exceptions applicable to an institution's (or a student-athlete's) return from regular-season competition that occurs during a vacation period and an institution's (or a student-athlete's) return from postseason events.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 131 (NO. 2-94) TRAVEL EXPENSES — NCAA CHAMPIONSHIPS AND POSTSEASON BOWL GAMES

Intent: To limit the application of the travel-expense formula in 16.8.1.4.1 to travel in conjunction with NCAA championships or postseason bowl games.

Bylaws: Amend 16.8.1.4, page 202, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.8.1.4 Travel to NCAA Championships and *Special Events* Post-season Bowl Games During Vacation Period.

"16.8.1.4.1 General Rule. The institution may provide the transportation for a student-athlete to travel from campus to the site of an NCAA championship or a *special event* **post-season bowl game** and back to campus; or if the student-athlete goes home during the vacation period, the institution may pay (in lieu of providing team transportation) the greater of the transportation costs for the student-athlete to travel from:"

[Remainder of 16.8.1.4 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The current legislation applies to NCAA championships or "special events" that occur during the vacation period; however, there appears to be inconsistency in the way institutions are defining "special events." This proposal will eliminate the need for institutions to determine whether a particular contest qualifies as a "special event."

Action: Adopted.

NO. 132 (NO. 2-96) EXPENSES — STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Intent: To permit student-athletes to receive expenses from an institution or conference to attend conference, regional or national student-athlete advisory committee meetings.

Bylaws: Amend 16.10.1 by adding new 16.10.1.9, page 203, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

A-168 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

"16.10.1.9 Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Meetings. An institution or conference may pay actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete to attend conference, regional or national student-athlete advisory committee meetings."

Source: NCAA Council (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee reviewed the preliminary results of a survey conducted last spring regarding the existence and nature of campus and conference-level student-athlete advisory committees. The majority of the institutions responding to the survey have student-athlete advisory committees on their campuses, and the majority of the institutions responding that do not have student-athlete advisory committees on their campuses are interested in forming such committees. However, a majority of the conferences responding to the survey indicated that they do not have student-athlete advisory committees on the conference level. The committee believes that student-athletes should be encouraged and permitted to meet with student-athletes from other campuses on a conference, regional or national level. This proposal is consistent with the goal of having more knowledgeable student-athletes involved in the advisory and decision-making processes on campuses and within conferences.

Action: Adopted.

Recruiting

NO. 133 (NO. 2-36) TRANSFER — HEARING OPPORTUNITY

Intent: To specify that there be an institutional appeals process for student-athletes when permission is denied to contact institutions about transferring, or when the institution will not provide the certification that it has no objection to the student-athlete transferring and being immediately eligible pursuant to the one-time transfer exception.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.1.3, by adding new 13.1.1.3.1, page 81, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.1.1.3.1 Hearing Opportunity. If the institution decides to deny a student-athlete's request to permit any other institution to contact the student-athlete about transferring, the institution shall inform the student-athlete that he or she, upon request, shall be provided a hearing conducted by an institutional entity or committee outside of the athletics department (e.g., the office of student affairs; office of the dean of students, or a committee com-

Legislative Proposals _____ A-169

posed of the faculty athletics representative, student-athletes and nonathletics faculty/staff members). The institution shall have established reasonable procedures for promptly hearing such a request."

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.6.5.3.10, page 151, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.6.5.3.10 One-Time Transfer Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year collegiate institution and all of the following conditions are met:

[14.6.5.3.10-(a) through 14.6.5.3.10-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) The student's previous institution certifies in writing that it has no objection to the student's being granted an exception to the transfer residence requirement. **If the student's previous institution denies his or her request for the release, the institution shall inform the student-athlete that he or she, upon request, shall be provided a hearing conducted by an institutional entity or committee outside of the athletics department (e.g., the office of student affairs; office of the dean of students, or a committee composed of the faculty athletics representative, student-athletes and nonathletics faculty/staff members). The institution shall have established reasonable procedures for promptly hearing such a request and"**

[Remainder of 14.6.5.3.10 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee)

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Student-athletes often encounter problems when attempting to transfer to another institution, and often are not given specific reasons why they are not allowed to talk to other institutions about transferring or why they have been denied a release under the one-time transfer exception. Further, it appears that some athletics directors grant or deny releases based on the recommendation of coaches, who may decide to grant or deny a release for personal reasons, as opposed to what is in the best interests of the student-athlete.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II. Part A adopted by Division III.

NO. 134 (NO. 2-34) RECRUITING — EVALUATIONS

Intent: In Division I, to specify that in all sports, an evaluation occurs at a prospect's practice or competition only if the prospect is observed practicing or competing.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.02.5, page 78, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.02.5 Evaluation. Evaluation is any off-campus activity designed to assess the academic qualifications or athletics ability

A-170 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

of a prospect, including any visit to a prospect's educational institution (during which no contact occurs) or the observation of a **prospect participating in** any practice or competition at any site at which the prospect participates."

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.7.6, page 87, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.7.6 Evaluations in Individual Sports. *In individual sports, an institution shall utilize an evaluation for each prospect participating at any time on a given day in a competition. Thus, a* **An institution's coach who is attending a competition in an individual sport (e.g., track meet, swimming meet, tennis match) on a specific day shall utilize an evaluation only for those all participants that the coach observes in the competition on that day engaging in practice or competition.**"

Source: All members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Current legislation indicates that in individual sports, an evaluation of a prospect occurs if a coach observes any portion of an event (e.g., track meet, swim meet, tennis match) even if the institution's coach does not observe the prospect compete. For example, if a prospect competes at 9 a.m. and the coach does not arrive at the event until 1 p.m., an evaluation of that prospect has occurred. No reasonable method exists for a coach to record or for the institution to monitor evaluations of prospects whom the coach has not observed or did not know competed in the contest that the coach attended. Adoption of this proposal would require coaches to count evaluations only for prospects whom the coach actually observes participate in practice or competition.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee voted to support this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 135 (NO. 2-52) RECRUITING — USE OF SCOUTING SERVICES

Intent: To prohibit the use of published recruiting or scouting services, but to continue to allow an institution to use video scouting services.

Bylaws: Amend 13.15.3, page 107, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.15.3 *Published Recruiting Services*

"13.15.3.1 Published Services. An institution may **not** subscribe to **any** regularly published recruiting or scouting service involving prospects, *provided this service is made available to all institutions desiring to subscribe and at the same fee rate for all subscribers.*

"13.15.3.2 Video Services. Member institutions are permitted to use video services so long as only regularly

Legislative Proposals _____ A-171

scheduled (regular season) high-school or two-year college contests are involved. The institution may not contract with the service in advance to have a particular contest videotaped, and the service must be available to all institutions at the same cost."

[Remainder of 13.5.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Recruiting Committee believes that limited information is obtained from scouting-service publications. Some institutions believe they are forced to subscribe to recruiting services so that the publishers of these services will promote those institutions. Even in this environment of cost containment, the vast majority of recruiting decisions are based on observations rather than an opinion expressed in a scouting or recruiting service publication. In light of the number of prospects evaluated annually, and given the improved quality of the information made available through video, it seems appropriate not to restrict video services in any sport at this time.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 135-1 RECRUITING — USE OF SCOUTING SERVICES

Intent: To permit the use of published recruiting or scouting services in sports other than football and basketball.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 135, 13.15.3.1, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.15.3.1 Published Services. **In the sports of football and basketball, an institution may not subscribe to any published recruiting or scouting service involving prospects. In all other sports, an institution may subscribe to a regularly published recruiting or scouting service, provided the service is made available to all institutions desiring to subscribe and at the same fee rate for all subscribers.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Rationale: The Council's concern related to the use of published scouting services primarily is associated with the sports of football and basketball; therefore, no prohibition is recommended for other sports.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 136 (NO. 2-48) TRYOUTS — NONSCHOLASTIC-BASED BASKETBALL

Intent: To specify that a member of an institution's coaching staff may not participate in coaching activities involving nonscholastic-based basketball teams conducted primarily during the summer.

A-172 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

Bylaws: Amend 13.12.1.4, page 101, as follows.

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.12.1.4 **AAU Nonscholastic-Based Basketball.** A member of an institution's coaching staff may not participate in coaching activities involving **AAU nonscholastic-based basketball teams competing primarily during the summer**, regardless of the age or gender of the participants involved in such teams."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) has expressed concern to the NCAA Recruiting Committee that AAU basketball competition often is confused with other basketball leagues and tournaments, and that the term "AAU" is used by the Association's membership in a generic manner. This proposal will broaden the application of the legislation to cover coaching activities involving all nonscholastic-based basketball teams, including AAU teams competing primarily during the summer.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 137 (NO. 2-49) RECRUITING — DIVISION II TRYOUTS

Intent: To permit a prospective student-athlete participating in a Division II tryout to participate against a member institution's team at any time during the academic year.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.12.2.1, page 102, as follows:

[Division II only]

"13.12.2.1 Division II Tryouts. A Division II member institution may conduct a tryout of a prospect only on its campus and only under the following conditions:

[13.12.2.1-(a) through 13.12.2.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Competition against the member institution's team is permissible, provided such competition occurs during the *institution's playing season per 17.1.1 academic year and is considered a countable athletically related activity per 17.02.1.1-(c).*"

[Remainder of 13.12.2.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.1.1, pages 209-210, as follows:

[Division II only]

"17.02.1.1 Countable Athletically Related Activities. The following are considered countable athletically related activities and must be counted in the weekly or daily time limitations specified under 17.1.5.1 for Divisions I and II:

[17.02.1.1-(a) through 17.02.1.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) **In Division II only, required participation in permissible tryouts of prospective student-athletes per 13.12.2.1. If participation occurs outside the institu-**

Legislative Proposals _____ A-173

tion's declared playing season, it shall be counted as part of the conditioning activities specified in (c) above;"

[17.02.1.1-(e) through 17.02.1.1-(j), relettered as 17.02.1.1-(f) through 17.02.1.1-(k), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The liberalization of the permissible Division II tryout legislation will create greater flexibility on campus related to the recruitment of prospective student-athletes. The proposal also will allow a prospect to get a better understanding of the institution's campus and its student-athletes.

Action: Adopted by Division II.

NO. 138 (NO. 2-149) EVALUATIONS — DIVISION II MEN'S BASKETBALL

Intent: To specify that Division II men's basketball coaches may evaluate prospects during any boys' high-school all-star game that occurs within the state in which the member institution is located.

Bylaws: Amend 30.10.3, page 386, as follows:
[Division II only]

"30.10.3 Basketball, Division II Men's. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to men's basketball in Division II:
[30.10.3-(a) through 30.10.3-(h), unchanged.]

"(i) **During any high-school all-star game that occurs within the state in which the member institution is located:**

[30.10.3-(i), relettered as 30.10.3-(j), unchanged.]

Source: Mankato State University; Morehouse College; University of Nebraska, Omaha; University of North Alabama; North Dakota State University; Northern Kentucky University; University of South Dakota, and Texas A&M University, Kingsville.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This legislation will permit men's basketball coaches to evaluate prospects during any high-school all-star game that occurs within the state in which the member institution is located. Since high-school all-star games typically are conducted subsequent to the signing of the National Letter of Intent, prospective student-athletes who are participants generally have committed to an institution. Therefore, the intent of this legislation is to observe the athletes' performance without regard to the recruitment process.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee voted to support this proposal.

A-174 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

Action: Adopted by Division II.

NO. 139 (NO. 2-38) RECRUITING — TELEPHONE CALLS — DIVISION II FOOTBALL

Intent: In Division II football, to preclude telephone contact with a prospective student-athlete prior to August 15 following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school; to limit telephone contact to once per week from August 15 through November 30; to permit telephone contacts with a prospective student-athlete at the institution's discretion between December 1 and February 15, and to limit additional telephone contact from February 16 through August 14 of the prospect's senior year to once per week.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.4, pages 82-83, as follows:

[Division II football only]

"13.1.2.4 General Restrictions: Staff Members and Governing Board. The following are additional restrictions that apply to an institution's staff members and governing board:

[13.1.2.4-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) **Telephone Contact.** In Divisions I and II sports other than Divisions I-A and, I-AA and II football, staff members shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) prior to July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school; thereafter, staff members shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) more than once per week, but may accept collect calls from the prospect. In Divisions I-A and, I-AA and II football, staff members shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) prior to August 15 following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school. Thereafter, from August 15 through November 30, telephone contact with a prospective student-athlete is limited to once per week. From December 1 through February 15, telephone contact may be made with a senior prospective student-athlete at the institution's discretion. From February 16 through August 14, Divisions I-A and, I-AA and II football staff members shall not telephone a senior prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) more than once per week. In all sports, staff members in Divisions I and II shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) during the conduct of any of the institution's intercollegiate athletics contests in that sport."

[Remainder of 13.1.2.4 unchanged.]

Source: Augustana College (South Dakota); Fort Lewis College; Mankato State University; University of Nebraska at Kearney; University of Nebraska, Omaha; University of North Alabama; North Dakota State University; Pittsburg State University; University of South Dakota; South Dakota State University, and Texas A&M University, Kingsville.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-175

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will make the telephone contact rule in Division II football generally consistent with the telephone contact rule in Divisions I-A and I-AA football. Division II football institutions recruit extensively against Division I-AA institutions for student-athletes, and on occasion, recruit against Division I-A institutions. By allowing Divisions I-A and I-AA to make calls at the institution's discretion during December 1 through February 15, while Division II institutions cannot, an unfair advantage is gained by the Divisions I-A and I-AA institutions. For those Division II football schools whose coaches currently are calling prospects during the July 1 through August 15 time period, the expense of adding an unlimited calling period would be offset by the elimination of the July 1 through August 15 time period.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee voted to support this proposal.

Action: Moot.

NO. 140 (NO. 2-39) RECRUITING — TELEPHONE CALLS — DIVISION I

Intent: To permit Division I institutions to use a toll-free (1-800) telephone number to receive telephone calls from prospective student-athletes.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.4-(b)-(2), page 83, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A and all other Division I members, divided vote]

"(2) Collect and Toll-Free Telephone Calls — Division I. Institutional staff members may accept collect telephone calls placed by prospective student-athletes, provided the calls are placed no earlier than July 1 following completion of the prospect's junior year in high school. An institution may *not* utilize a toll-free (1-800) number to receive telephone calls from prospective student-athletes, prospects' parents or legal guardians. *An institution may establish a toll-free number outside of the athletics department (e.g., admissions office), provided the number is available to all prospective students.*"

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; University of Cincinnati; Clemson University; University of Florida; University of Hawaii; University of Houston; University of Louisville; Memphis State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Rice University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas, El Paso; Texas A&M University; U.S. Military Academy, and West Virginia University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal represents a cost-cutting measure to prevent institutions from paying premium rates for operator-assist-

ed collect calls. Rates for a telephone call through a 1-800 number are substantially lower.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted by Division I-A and Division I other than I-A.

NO. 141 (NO. 2-43) RECRUITING — AUTOMOBILE TRANSPORTATION

Intent: To eliminate the requirement that an institution utilizes an official visit for each prospective student-athlete in an automobile if the institution reimburses the prospect that it is recruiting for his/her automobile transportation expenses.

Bylaws: Amend 13.6.2.9, pages 92-93, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.6.2.9 Transportation of Prospect's Relatives or Friends. An institution shall not permit its athletics department staff members or representatives of its athletics interests to pay, provide or arrange for the payment of transportation costs incurred by relatives or friends of a prospect to visit the campus or elsewhere; however, an institution may.

"(a) Provide automobile mileage reimbursement to a prospect on an official visit, even if relatives or friends accompany the prospect, *however, in that event the trip shall count as an official paid visit only for each recruited prospect in the automobile, and*"

[Remainder of 13.6.2.9 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: It is unreasonable to require an institution to count an official visit for each prospect in an automobile even if the institution is not recruiting the other individuals. For example, if a prospect's brother is a sophomore high-school athlete and accompanies the prospect on his or her visit, the institution could not reimburse the prospect being recruited for his or her automobile transportation because current legislation would require the institution to count the brother's visit as an official visit. This proposal would specify that the visit would count as an official visit only for the prospect being recruited.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I, II and III.

NO. 142 (NO. 2-35) MEALS DURING UNOFFICIAL VISITS — DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent: To specify that Division I-AA football programs that do not provide more than 25 official visits may provide a meal to any football prospect (and the prospects' parents or legal guardians) in the institution's on-campus student dining facilities without requiring that it be considered an official visit, provided the prospect is not provided with an official visit.

- A. Bylaws: Amend 13.02.11.2 by adding new 13.02.11.2.1, page 80, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"13.02.11.2.1 Exception — Division I-AA. A Division I-AA football program that restricts its total number of official visits to 25 may provide one meal to any football prospect in the institution's on-campus student dining facilities without the visit counting as an official visit. The institution also may provide one meal to the same prospect's parents or legal guardians in the institution's on-campus student dining facilities without the visit counting as an official visit, provided it is the institution's normal policy to provide such a meal under similar circumstances to all prospective students' parents or legal guardians visiting the campus. A prospect who is given such a meal may not also be provided by the institution with an official visit in any sport."

- B. Bylaws: Amend 13.8.2.1.1.1 by adding new 13.8.2.1.1.1.1, page 97, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"13.8.2.1.1.1.1 Exception — Division I-AA. A Division I-AA football program that restricts its total number of official visits to 25 may provide one meal to any football prospect in the institution's on-campus student dining facilities without the visit counting as an official visit. The institution also may provide one meal to the same prospect's parents or legal guardians in the institution's on-campus student dining facilities without the visit counting as an official visit, provided it is the institution's normal policy to provide such a meal under similar circumstances to all prospective students' parents or legal guardians visiting the campus. A prospect who is given such a meal may not also be provided by the institution with an official visit in any sport."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee)

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Many Division I-AA football programs offer financial aid on the basis of financial need unrelated to athletics ability. The size of their football squads are dependent on attracting large numbers of young men to campus as recruits. An institution that provides no more than 25 official visits should be allowed to encourage walk-ons by providing not more than a meal to a prospect. Any visits by other prospects, which would be unofficial visits, may include only one meal. Most of the institutions that may use this proposal were classified in Division III in the sport of football prior to September 1, 1993, and formerly were not subject to limits on the number of official visits. Institutional budgetary controls, therefore, limit the total number of such visits.

Action: Adopted by Division I-AA.

NO. 143 (NO. 2-46) UNOFFICIAL VISIT — PARKING

Intent: To permit a Division I institution to provide special parking for a prospect attending an institution's campus athletics event during an unofficial visit to the institution's campus.

Bylaws: Amend 13.8.2.1.5, page 98, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.8.2.1.5 Parking. An institution may not arrange special parking for prospects to utilize while attending a member institution's campus athletics event during an unofficial visit."

Source: All members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Institutions currently are permitted to provide a prospective student-athlete making an unofficial visit with three complimentary admissions to campus athletics events. Providing parking for the prospect who is visiting the institution's campus is a courtesy that should be extended.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee voted to support this proposal.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 144 (NO. 2-50) RECRUITING — SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS

Intent: To specify that in Division I only, noninstitutional basketball camps or clinics held on the campus of a member institution shall be subject to the provisions of 13.13.1.2 (senior prospect prohibition) and 13.13.1.5 (no free or reduced admission privileges).

Bylaws: Amend 13.13.4, by adding new 13.13.4.3, page 107, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.13.4.3 Institutional Responsibility — Camps and Clinics Conducted on Division I Campuses. A Division I institution shall be responsible for ensuring that privately owned camps or clinics conducted on its campus shall be subject to the provisions of 13.13.1.2 (senior prospect prohibition) and 13.13.1.5 (no free or reduced admission privileges)."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Recruiting Committee believes that even though noninstitutional camps held on Division I campuses are required to be certified per Bylaw 30.15 in order for coaches to attend, it is important that Division I institutions be responsible for the

actions of such camps related to the enrollment of senior prospects and free or reduced admissions privileges.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 145 (NO. 2-47) RECRUITING — GIFTS AT COACHES' CLINIC

Intent: To prohibit high-school, college preparatory and two-year college coaches from receiving any prizes in conjunction with an institution's coaches' clinic, including prizes donated by outside sponsors.

Bylaws: Amend 13.9.2.1, page 99, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.9.2.1 Gifts at Coaches' Clinic. An institution may not provide gifts to high-school, preparatory school or two-year college coaches in conjunction with its coaches' clinic or other events. This specifically prohibits the provision of a door prize to the coach, even if the cost of the prize is included in the cumulative admissions fee (i.e., the admission fee charged to each person, when combined, would cover the cost of the prize). *The coach may receive a door prize selected in a random drawing, provided the prize is donated by a sponsor outside the institution (e.g., athletics manufacturer or distributor). Further, materials (e.g., clipboards, file folders) may be provided to each person attending the clinic, provided the items are included in the registration or admission fee.*"

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Interpretations Committee has expressed concern that institutions are soliciting door prizes from outside sponsors for their institutional coaching clinics. The prohibition against receiving these prizes creates a more "level playing field" as it pertains to institutional coaching clinics.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I, II and III.

NO. 146 (NO. 2-51) SUMMER BASKETBALL EVENT CERTIFICATION

Intent: To require that all noninstitutional basketball events (e.g., camps, leagues, tournaments, festivals) held during the July evaluation period be subject to the NCAA summer basketball camp certification program.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.13.5, page 107, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.13.5 Division I Coaches' Attendance at Summer Basketball Camps **Events**. A member of an institution's basketball coaching staff may attend only institutional summer basketball camps per Bylaw 13.13.1.1 and noninstitutional camps **organized events held during the July evaluation period** that are certified per Bylaw 30.15."

A-180 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

B. Bylaws: Amend 30.15, page 391, as follows:

[Division I only]

"30.15 SUMMER BASKETBALL CAMP EVENT CERTIFICATION

"In order for a summer basketball camp **event** to be certified, a certification application form must be submitted each year to the NCAA national office not later than April 1. An **camp event** review form for each **camp event** also must be submitted to the NCAA national office not later than October 1 subsequent to the **camp event** sessions. The following criteria must be met by each **camp event** in order to be certified:

"(a) Admissions fees charged to all **camp event** participants must be similar;

"(b) Noninstitutional camps **events** shall not employ Division I coaches;

"(c) No air or ground transportation or other gifts or inducements shall be provided to the **campers event participants** or their coaches or relatives;

"(d) A prospective student-athlete who attends an NCAA certified **camp event** shall not retain any athletics equipment provided for his or her use at the **camp event** other than an **camp event** T-shirt, and

"(e) Compensation provided to **camp event** personnel shall be commensurate with the going rate for **camp event** personnel of like teaching ability and **camp event** experience."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The summer basketball camp certification program should be broadened to include all noninstitutional basketball events in order to eliminate the current practice of changing the format of the camp or activity to circumvent the current legislation. During the past summer, many camps eliminated their on- and off-court instructional elements and other noncompetitive activities in order to avoid being classified as a noninstitutional camp, which would require the camp to be certified. This proposal would require all such events to be certified, which is consistent with the original intent of the certification program.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

General

NO. 147 (NO. 2-9) BUDGETARY CONTROL

Intent: To specify that each member institution shall be required to determine, on an annual basis, all athletically related revenues and expenditures on a standardized reporting form.

Constitution: Amend 6.2.1, page 42, as follows:

Legislative Proposals _____ A-181

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]
"6.2.1 Normal Budgeting Procedures. The institution's annual budget for its intercollegiate athletics programs shall be controlled by the institution and subject to its normal budgeting procedures.

"6.2.1.1 Annual Report. The institution shall determine, on an annual basis, all athletics revenues and expenditures on a standardized form developed by the Association and approved by the NCAA Council. This form shall be available for examination upon request by an authorized representative of the NCAA."

Source: All members of the Mid-American Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to require an institution to determine the actual expenses of conducting an intercollegiate athletics program and to disclose that information on a standardized form developed by the Association and approved by the NCAA Council. As the issues of gender equity and cost containment begin to shape the future of intercollegiate athletics, it becomes increasingly important for a member institution to produce a clearer and more accurate account of its athletics revenues and expenditures. Constitution 6.2.3 currently specifies that an institution is subject to an annual financial audit. This amendment will strengthen this audit requirement, as well as the financial oversight of the institution's chief executive officer, by establishing the actual expense of conducting its intercollegiate athletics program.

Committee Position (Research Committee): Although the committee took no position with respect to this proposal, it affirmed the value of a standardized method for reporting revenues and expenses. Further, the committee observed that, if such data was collected on an annual basis, it would be useful to gather and publish the results in an aggregate format.

Action: Motion to refer to appropriate NCAA committee adopted.

NO. 148 (NO. 2-8) NCAA STAFF INTERPRETATIONS

Intent: To specify that an interpretation of NCAA legislation issued by the NCAA legislative services staff is not binding.

Constitution: Amend 5.4.1.2, page 37, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.4.1.2 Interpretation Process

"5.4.1.2.1 Response to Request. The legislative services staff shall respond to a request from a member institution for an interpretation of NCAA rules. Such an interpretation is binding on the institution unless it is modified by the Interpretations Committee.

"5.4.1.2.2 5.4.1.2.1 Review. A member institution may request a review by that the Interpretations Committee of any interpreta-

tion provided by the legislative services staff review the application of NCAA legislation. Such a request must be processed in writing by the institution's conference or by one of the five individuals who are authorized to request such interpretations on behalf of the institution [i.e., chief executive officer, faculty athletics representative, athletics director, senior woman administrator, compliance coordinator, or designated substitute(s) for the chief executive officer and/or athletics director, as specified in writing to the national office]."
[5.4.1.2.3 and 5.4.1.2.4 renumbered as 5.4.1.2.2 and 5.4.1.2.3, unchanged.]

Source: University of Connecticut; Iowa State University; University of Maryland, College Park; University of North Carolina, Wilmington; North Carolina State University; University of North Texas; Northwestern State University (Louisiana); University of Oklahoma; Providence College; St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania); Stephen F. Austin State University, and Villanova University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will encourage institutions and conferences to take greater responsibility for understanding and applying NCAA rules. The NCAA staff's role will return to one of assisting the membership rather than the current situation, which often places the staff in the position of appearing to direct members to take certain actions. Accordingly, this proposal will enhance the relationship between the staff and the membership without lessening the understanding of the proper application of NCAA rules or decreasing staff services. Where issues that may have national impact need to be addressed more formally, the Interpretations Committee-Council process remains in place. The staff will continue its efforts to provide consistent responses to requests for assistance and to improve a data base of information to assist members in applying the legislation it has adopted.

Committee Position (Interpretations Committee): The committee deferred taking action on this proposal until the screening system implemented by the legislative services staff can be evaluated.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 149 (NO. 2-10) TOBACCO PRODUCTS

Intent: To prohibit the use of tobacco products by student-athletes, coaches and game officials during practice and competition in all sports.

A. Bylaws: Amend 11.1 by adding new 11.1.7, page 50, as follows:
[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"11.1.7 Use of Tobacco Products. The use of tobacco products is prohibited by coaches and game officials in all sports during practice and competition."

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 14.1 by adding new 14.1.5, page 121, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.1.5 Use of Tobacco Products. A student-athlete who uses tobacco products during practice or competition in any sport shall be ineligible for further participation in intercollegiate athletics, subject to appeal to the NCAA Eligibility Committee for restoration of eligibility."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: In 1990, at the request of the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, the NCAA banned the use of tobacco products at NCAA championships by any individual on the field of play, as well as during other activities such as banquets, autograph sessions, press conferences and postgame interviews. Many conferences and institutions have adopted similar policies in conjunction with their events. A study by the NCAA showed a 40-percent increase in the use of smokeless tobacco by student-athletes from 1985 to 1989; a replication study in 1993 showed a slight decrease in the level of use; however, use continues to increase in sports such as men's and women's basketball, tennis and track and field, as well as softball and women's swimming. The Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports and the NCAA Professional Sports Liaison Committee agree that a ban on the use of tobacco products will further the Association's goal of maximizing the health and welfare of student-athletes.

Action: Adopted as amended by 149-1.

NO. 149-1

TOBACCO PRODUCTS

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete who uses tobacco products during practice or competition shall be disqualified for the remainder of the practice or competition, as opposed to becoming ineligible for intercollegiate athletics.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 149-B, 14.1.5, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.1.5 Use of Tobacco Products. A student-athlete who uses tobacco products during practice or competition in any sport shall be ineligible for further participation in intercollegiate athletics, subject to appeal to the NCAA Eligibility Committee for restoration of eligibility."

"17.1.11 Use of Tobacco Products. The use of tobacco products by a student-athlete is prohibited during practice and competition. A student-athlete who uses tobacco products during a practice or competition shall be disqualified for the remainder of that practice or competition."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports).

Rationale: Rendering a student-athlete ineligible for further participation in intercollegiate athletics for using tobacco products is arguably too harsh a penalty. It is more appropriate for a student-athlete who uses tobacco products during practice or competition to be disqualified for the remainder of the practice or competition.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 150 (NO. 2-143) COMMITTEES — TERM OF OFFICE

Intent: To specify that the members of all general and sports committees shall serve a single term of four years, unless otherwise specified legislatively.

Bylaws: Amend 21.1.2, page 349, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.1.2 Term of Office

"21.1.2.1 *Three* **Four-Year Term.** Unless otherwise specified, the members of the committees listed in this bylaw shall be appointed or elected for *three* **four-year** terms. A member's term of service shall commence on the first day of September following the member's election or appointment.

"21.1.2.2 *Reappointment* **Appointment or Reelection Election.** Members may be *reappointed* **appointed** or *reelected* **elected** for one *additional* term. A former member may be appointed or elected to an additional term after three years have elapsed. An individual who has served three terms on a committee may not serve further on that committee.

"21.1.2.2.1 *Exception.* This *reappointment* **appointment or reelection election** provision shall not apply to the members of committees whose terms of office are specified under their respective sections of this bylaw. Such committees are:"

[Remainder of 21.1.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Review and Planning).

Effective Date: Immediately; effective for committee appointments and elections made during and subsequent to the 1994 NCAA Convention.

Rationale: Establishing a single four-year term will address the membership's concerns regarding access to NCAA committee service.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 151 (NO. 2-147) SPORTS COMMITTEES

Intent: To increase the size of the Division III Baseball, Division III Women's Basketball, Men's and Women's Golf, Men's Soccer, Di-

vision II Women's Volleyball and Division III Women's Volleyball Committees, and to establish separate Divisions I, II and III Women's Softball Committees.

Bylaws: Amend 21.6, pages 363-365, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.6 SPORTS COMMITTEES WITH ONLY CHAMPIONSHIPS ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES

[21.6.1 through 21.6.3 unchanged.]

"21.6.4 Baseball Committee, Division III. The Division III Baseball Committee shall consist of *six* **eight** members.

[21.6.5 through 21.6.9 unchanged.]

"21.6.10 Basketball Committee, Division III Women's. The Division III Women's Basketball Committee shall consist of *six* **eight** members.

[21.6.11 through 21.6.15 unchanged.]

"21.6.16 Golf Committee, Men's and Women's. The Men's and Women's Golf Committee shall consist of *14* **18** members, including *seven* **nine** members from Division I, *three* **four** members from Division II, *three* **four** members from Division III and one member elected at large. *Eight* **Twelve** members shall represent men's golf interests, including *four* **six** from Division I and *two* **three** each from Divisions II and III. Six members shall represent women's golf interests, including three from Division I, one each from Divisions II and III and one elected at large.

[Remainder of 21.6.16 and 21.6.17 through 21.6.21 unchanged.]

"21.6.22 Soccer Committee, Men's. The Men's Soccer Committee shall consist of *12* **16** members, including not more than one member from any men's soccer region in any division. *Six* **Eight** members shall be from Division I, *three* **four** members shall be from Division II and *three* **four** members shall be from Division III.

[21.6.23 unchanged.]

"21.6.24 Softball Committee, **Division I Women's**. The **Division I Women's Softball Committee** shall consist of *12* **six** members, including *six* members from Division I, *three* members from Division II and *three* members from Division III.

"21.6.25 Softball Committee, **Division II Women's**. The **Division II Women's Softball Committee** shall consist of *six* **members**.

"21.6.26 Softball Committee, **Division III Women's**. The **Division III Women's Softball Committee** shall consist of *six* **members**.

[21.6.25 through 21.6.27, renumbered as 21.6.27 through 21.6.29, unchanged.]

"21.6.30 Volleyball Committee, Division II Women's. The Division II Women's Volleyball Committee shall consist of *six* **eight** members.

"21.6.31 Volleyball Committee, Division III Women's. The Division

III Women's Volleyball Committee shall consist of *four* **eight** members."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This legislation will permit the sports committees to fulfill their responsibilities more effectively and to better represent the membership.

Action: Adopted.

Enforcement

NO. 152 (NO. 2-133) ENFORCEMENT — MISSION STATEMENT

Intent: To establish a mission statement applicable to the NCAA enforcement program.

Bylaws: Amend 19.01 by adding new 19.01.1, page 315, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"19.01.1 Mission of NCAA Enforcement Program. It shall be the mission of the NCAA enforcement program to eliminate violations of NCAA rules and impose appropriate penalties should violations occur. The program is committed to fairness of procedures and the timely and equitable resolution of infractions cases. The achievement of these objectives is essential to the conduct of a viable and effective enforcement program. Further, an important consideration in imposing penalties is to provide fairness to uninvolved student-athletes, coaches, administrators, competitors and other institutions."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee to Review the NCAA Penalty Structure).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Special Committee to Review the NCAA Penalty Structure believes that it is appropriate to state the objectives of the enforcement program, which include providing fairness to uninvolved student-athletes, coaches, administrators, competitors and other institutions when imposing appropriate penalties.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 153 (NO. 2-134) ENFORCEMENT — SECONDARY AND MAJOR VIOLATIONS

Intent: To eliminate repeated secondary violations from the definition of a major violation, while retaining the principle that repeated secondary violations may warrant the imposition of a penalty appropriate for a major violation.

Bylaws: Amend 19.02.2.1, pages 315-316, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"19.02.2.1 Violation, Secondary. A secondary violation is one that provides only a limited recruiting or competitive advantage and that is isolated or inadvertent in nature. **Repeated secondary violations by a member institution also may be identified by the assistant executive director for enforcement as a major violation. If the Committee on Infractions determines that repeated secondary violations have occurred and that the institution is not taking appropriate action to prevent such violations, a penalty appropriate for a major violation may be imposed.**

"19.02.2.2 Violation, Major. All violations other than secondary violations are major violations, specifically including those that provide an extensive recruiting or competitive advantage. *Repeated secondary violations by a member institution also may be identified by the assistant executive director for enforcement as major violations.*"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee to Review the NCAA Penalty Structure).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal clarifies the authority of the Committee on Infractions to impose a penalty appropriate for a major violation if an institution is involved in repeated secondary violations.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 154 (NO. 2-137) ENFORCEMENT — SECONDARY VIOLATIONS

Intent: To permit the Committee on Infractions to accept institutional- or conference-determined penalties and establish additional disciplinary measures as specified that may be imposed for secondary violations.

Bylaws: Amend 19.5.1, page 318, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"19.5.1 Penalties for Secondary Violations. The assistant executive director for enforcement, upon approval by the chair or another member of the Committee on Infractions designated by the chair, or the committee may determine that no penalty is warranted in a secondary case, **that an institutional- or conference-determined penalty is satisfactory** or, if appropriate, **require one or more of impose a penalty. Among the following alternatives, disciplinary measures are:**

[19.5.1-(a) and 19.5.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Prohibition of the head coach or other staff members in the involved sport from participating in any off-campus recruiting activities for **up to one year;**

[19.5.1-(d) through 19.5.1-(f) unchanged.]

"(g) **Suspension of the head coach or other staff members**

A-188 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

for one or more competitions;

"(h) **Public reprimand (to be invoked only in situations where the Committee on Infractions or the assistant executive director for enforcement, upon approval by the committee, determines that a penalty, in addition to any institutional- or conference-determined penalty, is warranted), and**

"(i) **Requirement that a member institution that has been found in violation, or that has an athletics department staff member who has been found in violation of the provisions of NCAA legislation while representing another institution, show cause why a penalty or an additional penalty should not be imposed if it does not take appropriate disciplinary or corrective action against the athletics department personnel involved, any other institutional employee if the circumstances warrant or representatives of the institution's athletics interests.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee to Review the NCAA Penalty Structure).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will permit greater flexibility in the imposition of appropriate penalties for secondary violations.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 155 (NO. 2-138) ENFORCEMENT — MAJOR VIOLATIONS

Intent: To establish a presumptive (as opposed to a prescribed minimum) penalty for a major violation as specified and eliminate a finding of uniqueness as a requirement for not imposing the minimum prescribed penalty; to reorganize and modify the current penalties for a major violation as specified.

A. Bylaws: Amend 19.5.2.1, pages 318-319, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"19.5.2.1 **19.5.2.2 Disciplinary Measures. In addition to those penalties prescribed for secondary violations, among the disciplinary measures, singly or in combination, that may be adopted by the committee (or the Infractions Appeals Committee) and imposed against an institution for major violations are:**

"(a) **Public reprimand and censure;**

"(b) **Probation for at least one year;**

"(c) *Probation for more than one year;*

"(d) **(c) A reduction in the number of financial aid awards (as defined in 15.02.3.1) that may be awarded during a specified period;**

"(e) **(d) Prohibition against the recruitment of prospective student-athletes for a sport or sports for a specified period;**

Legislative Proposals _____ A-189

"(f) (e) All or any combination of the following penalties:

"(1) Requirement that an institution that has been represented in an NCAA championship by a student-athlete who was recruited or who received improper benefits (which would not necessarily render the student-athlete ineligible) in violation of NCAA legislation shall return 90 percent of its share of net receipts from such competition in excess of the regular expense reimbursement. If such funds have not been distributed, they shall be withheld by the NCAA executive director, or

"(2) Individual or team records and performances shall be vacated or stricken, or

"(3) (2) Team records and performances shall be vacated or stricken, or

[19.5.2.1-(l)-(3) and 19.5.2.1-(f), renumbered as 19.5.2.2-(e)-(3) and 19.5.2.2-(f), unchanged.]

"(k) (h) Forfeiture of all or a portion of the institution's share of the broad-based revenue distribution monies for a specified period;

"(e) (i) Ineligibility for invitational and postseason meets and tournaments;

"(d) (j) Ineligibility for one or more NCAA championship events;

"(h) (k) Prohibition against an intercollegiate sports team or teams participating against outside competition for a specified period;

"(g) (l) Ineligibility of the member to vote or its personnel to serve on committees of the Association, or both;"

[19.5.2.1-(m), renumbered as 19.5.2.2-(m), and remainder of 19.5.2.1.1, renumbered as 19.5.2.2.2, unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 19.5.2.2, page 319, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"19.5.2.2 **19.5.2.1** Minimum **Presumptive** Penalty. The *minimum presumptive* penalty for a major violation, subject to exceptions authorized by the Committee on Infractions *in unique cases* on the basis of specifically stated reasons, *shall* **may** include **any** or all of the following:

"(a) A two-year probationary period (including a periodic in-person monitoring system and written institutional reports);

"(b) The *elimination of all* **reduction in the number** of expense-paid recruiting visits to the institution in the involved sport for one recruiting year;

"(c) A requirement that all coaching staff members in the sport be prohibited from engaging in any off-campus recruiting activities for **up to** one recruiting year;

"(d) A requirement that all institutional staff members determined by the committee knowingly to have engaged in or condoned a major violation be subject to:

"(1) Termination of employment; *to*

"(2) Suspension without pay for at least one year; *or to*

"(3) Reassignment of duties within the institution to a position that does not include contact with prospective or enrolled student-athletes or representatives of the institution's athletics interests for at least one year, **or**

"(4) **Other disciplinary action approved by the committee.**

"(f) (e) One year of television sanctions in the sport, and **A reduction in the number of financial aid awards;**

"(e) (f) One year of ~~s~~Sanctions precluding postseason competition in the sport, **particularly in those cases in which:**

"(1) **Involved individuals remain active in the program;**

"(2) **A significant competitive advantage results from the violation(s), or**

"(3) **The violation(s) reflect a lack of institutional control.**

"(g) Institutional recertification that the current athletics policies and practices conform to all requirements of NCAA regulations."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee to Review the NCAA Penalty Structure).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current "prescribed" or required penalties for major violations normally have not been applied by the Committee on Infractions because each case has been considered "unique" on its merits. A list of "presumptive" penalties will provide guidance to the committee but also will permit the committee to design penalties that address directly the abuses found in each case without having to justify the case as unique.

Action: Adopted as amended by 155-1.

NO. 155-1

ENFORCEMENT — MAJOR VIOLATIONS

Intent: To indicate that the presumptive penalty for a major violation shall include all of the penalties listed, subject to exceptions authorized by the Committee on Infractions.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 155-B, 19.5.2.1, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"19.5.2.1 Presumptive Penalty. The presumptive penalty for a major violation, subject to exceptions authorized by the Committee on Infractions on the basis of specifically stated reasons, *may* **shall** include *any* or all of the following:

[Remainder of 19.5.2.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Infractions Appeals Committee).

Rationale: The proposed amendment will continue to provide the Committee on Infractions greater flexibility to design appropriate

ate penalties that address directly the abuses found in each case without having to justify the case as unique.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 156 (NO. 2-139) ENFORCEMENT — REPEAT VIOLATORS

Intent: To eliminate a finding of "uniqueness" as a requirement for not imposing the prescribed penalty for a "repeat" violator; to permit as a minimum penalty for a repeat violator the imposition of any penalties prescribed for a major violation as well as any or all of the current penalties prescribed for a repeat violator.

Bylaws: Amend 19.5.2.3, pages 319-320, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"19.5.2.3 Repeat Violators. An institution shall be considered a 'repeat' violator if any major violation is found within the five-year period following the starting date of a major penalty. **In addition to the penalties identified for a major violation**, the minimum penalty for a repeat violator, subject to the exceptions authorized by the Committee on Infractions *in unique cases* on the basis of specifically stated reasons, *shall may* include **any or all** of the following:

"(a) The prohibition of some or all outside competition in the sport involved in the latest major violation for one or two sports seasons and the prohibition of all coaching staff members in that sport from involvement directly or indirectly in any coaching activities at the institutions during that period,

"(b) The elimination of all initial grants-in-aid and all recruiting activities in the sport involved in the latest major violation in question for a two-year period;

"(c) The requirement that all institutional staff members serving on the Presidents Commission, Council, Executive Committee or other committees of the Association resign those positions, it being understood that all institutional representatives shall be ineligible to serve on any NCAA committee for a period of four years, and

"(d) The requirement that the institution relinquish its voting privilege in the Association for a four-year period."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee to Review the NCAA Penalty Structure).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current prescribed or required penalties for a "repeat" violator normally have not been applied by the Committee on Infractions because each case has been considered unique on its merits. This proposal will give the committee more flexibility to design penalties that address directly the abuse found in the

case of a repeat violator without having to justify the case as unique. The committee may impose any of the penalties available for a major violator as well as any or all of the penalties currently prescribed for a repeat violator.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 157 (NO. 2-136) NCAA INFRACTIONS APPEALS COMMITTEE

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

Intent: To modify the current composition of the Infractions Appeals Committee in order to establish three separate division-specific appeals committees. [Note. References to the Infractions Appeals Committee found in 19.1.2, 19.3.1, 19.4.2.1, 19.5.2, 19.5.3, 21.3.14, 32.8 and 32.9, will be revised editorially if this legislation is adopted.]

Bylaws: Amend 19.2, page 317 as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"19.2 INFRACTIONS APPEALS COMMITTEES

"The Council shall appoint **an three division-specific** Infractions Appeals Committees, which shall hear and act upon appeals of the findings of major violations by the Committee on Infractions.

"19.2.1 Composition of Committees. The committees shall be composed of five members. At least one member shall be from the general public and shall not be connected with a collegiate institution, conference, or professional or similar sports organization, or represent coaches or athletes in any capacity. The remaining members shall presently or previously be on the staff of an active member institution or member conference, but shall not serve presently on the Council, Executive Committee or Presidents Commission.

"19.2.2 Authority and Duties of Committees. The committees shall hear and act upon appeals of the findings of major violations by the Committee on Infractions (see 32.8 and 32.9)."

Source: NCAA Council.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: With the adoption of 1993 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 55, an Infractions Appeals Committee was established to review decisions of the NCAA Committee on Infractions. The original proposal called for the creation of a committee composed of five members that would serve as the appellate body for decisions relative to all three divisions. The Council believes that it would be more appropriate to federate the committee in order to permit infractions appeals to be considered by a division-specific "jury of peers."

Action: Defeated.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-193

Championships

NO. 158 (NO. 2-132) MINIMUM SPONSORSHIP REQUIREMENTS — CHAMPIONSHIPS

Intent: To specify 40 as the minimum number of member institutions necessary to continue an existing division or National Collegiate Championship; to specify 50 as the minimum number of institutions necessary to establish a new championship in any sport, except that for a five-year period, 40 institutions will be necessary to establish a championship in a new women's sport; to specify that the minimum number of institutions necessary to establish a championship must exist for two consecutive academic years; to eliminate all exemptions related to the discontinuation of championships, except during 1994-95 for existing National Collegiate Championships; to specify that a championship shall be discontinued subsequent to the year in which it fails to meet the minimum sponsorship requirement, and to specify that if a National Collegiate Championship and a division championship exist in the same sport, sponsorship of the sport in which the division championship is conducted shall not be counted toward maintaining the National Collegiate Championship.

Bylaws: Amend 18.2, pages 308-309, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

18.2 CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHMENT OR CONTINUATION OF CHAMPIONSHIPS

"The establishment or continuation of an NCAA championship in a given sport shall be determined on the basis of the requirements in the following sections, with sponsorship of a sport based on the Association's records as of September 30 each year. [18.2.1 and 18.2.2 unchanged.]

"18.2.3 Championships Established Prior to 1982-83. The following criteria shall apply to sports in which the Association established championships prior to the 1982-83 academic year:

"(a) A National Collegiate Championship in a sport may be continued or established if at least seven percent of all active members of the Association sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis, regardless of whether a division championship is conducted in that sport, and

"(b) A division championship in a sport may be continued or established if at least seven percent of all active members and 20 percent of a division's active members sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis, provided such action does not preclude or eliminate a championship opportunity for members of the other divisions

"18.2.4 Championships Established in 1982-83 or Later. The following criteria shall apply to sports in which the Association had not established championships prior to the 1982-83 academic year.

"(a) A National Collegiate Championship in a sport may be continued or established if

at least 25 percent of all active members of the Association sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis, regardless of whether a division championship is conducted in that sport, and

"(b) A division championship in a sport may be continued or established if at least 25 percent of all active members and at least 25 percent of the active membership in each division sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis.

"18.2.3 Championships Existing During 1993-94. A National Collegiate Championship or a division championship that exists during the 1993-94 academic year may be continued if at least 40 member institutions sponsor the sport.

"18.2.3.1 National Collegiate and Division Championship in Same Sport. If a National Collegiate Championship and a division championship exist in the same sport, sponsorship of the sport in the division in which the division championship is conducted shall not count toward the minimum sponsorship number for the National Collegiate Championship.

"18.2.4 Championships Established During 1994-95 or Later. A National Collegiate Championship or a division championship may be established during the 1994-95 academic year or thereafter if at least 50 institutions sponsor the sport.

"18.2.4.1 Exception for Women's Sports During the 1994-95 through 1998-99 Academic Years. A National Collegiate Championship or a division championship may be established during the 1994-95 through 1998-99 academic years in a women's sport in which the Association does not already conduct a championship if at least 40 institutions sponsor the sport.

"18.2.4.2 Sponsorship Criteria

"18.2.4.2.1 Minimum Period. The applicable minimum sponsorship number must exist for two consecutive academic years in order for a championship to be established. Legislation to establish the championship may be proposed during the second year in which the minimum sponsorship number exists. Varsity sports sponsored prior to August 1, 1994, shall count toward the two-consecutive-year sponsorship requirement.

"18.2.4.2.2 National Collegiate and Division Championship in Same Sport. If a National Collegiate Championship and a division championship exist in the same sport, sponsorship of the sport in the division in which the division championship is conducted shall not count toward the minimum sponsorship number for the National Collegiate Championship.

[18.2.5 through 18.2.8 unchanged.]

"18.2.9 Subdivision Requirements. If a division subdivides for the administration of a sport, resulting in less than the applicable minimum *percentage number* of the division's active members sponsoring the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis in that subdivision, the subdivision shall meet the requirement within three years of the date the subdivision was created. It may establish and conduct a championship in the interim.

"18.2.10 Failure to Meet Minimum Sponsorship Requirements. A championship shall be discontinued automatically **at the conclusion of the academic year in which** it falls below the applicable minimum sponsorship *percentage number* set forth in 18.2.3 or 18.2.4 *for two consecutive years*.

"18.2.10.1 Division II Championships Exception. During the 1991-92, 1992-93 and 1993-94 academic years, an existing Division II championship shall not be canceled due to that division's failure to meet the minimum *percentage sponsorship requirements for maintaining the championship*

"18.2.10.2 **18.2.10.1 National Collegiate Championships Exception.** During the 1991-92, 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994-95 academic years, an existing National Collegiate Championship shall not be canceled, nor shall transportation and per diem expenses be discontinued, due to that championship's failure to meet the minimum *percentage or numerical sponsorship requirements for maintaining the championship*. Upon the expiration of this legislative exception, *any year(s) if during the 1991 1994-95 period that a championship fell below the applicable minimum numerical sponsorship percentage requirement set forth in 18.2.3 or 18.2.4, it shall count toward the two consecutive-year limitation be discontinued automatically.*

"18.2.11 Exemptions. The following are exempt from the minimum sponsorship *percentage requirements of 18.2.3 and 18.2.4 for championship continuation*.

"(a) A championship in which net receipts exceed all expenses, including the transportation and per diem expenses as specified in 31.4.6. The determination of receipts and expenses shall be based upon a moving three-year average.

"(b) A National Collegiate Championship for which all divisions are eligible and that was established prior to the 1982-83 academic year, provided that at least 50 member institutions sponsor the sport. Transportation expenses for the championship may be provided by the Association during the second consecutive year during which the championship falls below the applicable minimum sponsorship percentage set forth in 18.2.3, but subsequently shall not be provided by the Association in this circumstance;

"(c) A National Collegiate Championship that fails to meet the net-receipt requirement specified in 18.2.11-(a) and falls below the 50-institution sponsorship requirement specified in 18.2.11-(b) shall not be discontinued until the academic year subsequent to the year in which it fails to meet the 50-institution requirement."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: This proposal is based on results of the Executive Com-

A-196 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

mittee's year-long study of championships programs, which included a significant opportunity for membership review and comment, and has received strong membership support. It bases the establishment of a championship on a minimum number of institutions sponsoring the sport, rather than on a percentage figure. It also promotes gender equity by providing for the establishment of new women's championships while preserving existing championships.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 159 (NO. 2-140) MULTIDIVISION CLASSIFICATION

Intent: To permit a Division II institution to be classified in Division I in a sport in which there is a Division I and a Division III championship, but no Division II championship.

Bylaws: Amend 20.4.1.3, page 327, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"20.4.1.3 Divisions II and III Members — Classification of a Sport in Division I. A member of Division II or Division III may petition to be classified in Division I in any one men's sport, other than football or basketball, and in any one women's sport, other than basketball, and in any single sport in which the only NCAA championships opportunity is the National Collegiate Championship. **In addition, a member of Division II may be classified in Division I in a sport in which there is a Division I and a Division III championship, but no Division II championship.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: This proposal will provide an opportunity for those institutions that have previously designated one sport as Division I, per 20.4.1.3, to classify additional sports in Division I if no championship opportunity exists at the Division II level. If approved, this legislation will provide Division II institutions with championships opportunities in the sports of field hockey, men's ice hockey and men's lacrosse, as well as other sports in which the Division II championship might be discontinued due to low sponsorship numbers

Action: Adopted.

NO. 160 (NO. 2-152) CHAMPIONSHIPS — AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION

Intent: To permit an institution that has been a member of Division I for at least three years and also is a member of an existing Division I conference to be eligible for that conference's automatic qualification to the Division I Men's Basketball Championship if the conference has had an automatic bid during the previous eight consecutive years.

Bylaws: Amend 31.3.4.3.1, page 406, as follows.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-197

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"31.3.4.3.1 Continuity of Conference Membership. In keeping with the principles of duration and the continuity-of-membership requirement in Division I set forth in 31.3.4.3-(a), a conference that currently is receiving automatic qualification into the Division I Men's Basketball Championship shall be subject to the following requirements:

"(a) A conference that maintains continuity of membership in the conference by at least six of the same institutions for a period of five preceding academic years, all of which have been members of Division I for the eight preceding academic years, shall remain eligible for automatic qualification.

However, any new member added to a conference that maintains continuity of membership shall not represent the conference as the automatic qualifier until it has been a member of Division I for at least eight consecutive years, **except that a new member that joins a conference that also has been awarded an automatic bid for the previous eight consecutive years may represent the conference after the institution has been a member of Division I for at least three years."**

[Remainder of 31.3.4.3.1 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Ohio Valley Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The current rule has created significant hardship on institutions that have become Division I members and have joined existing Division I conferences with a long history of automatic-qualification status. In the case of the Ohio Valley Conference, two institutions have joined the conference in recent years, both moving up from Division II. These institutions offer broad-based programs with well over 100 grants-in-aid and with Division I-AA football programs. The support of their athletics programs exceeds many Division I institutions that are eligible for participation in the Division I Men's Basketball Championship through automatic qualification. The current rule cripples recruiting efforts and affects the full integration of these institutions into a conference to which they should belong due to their locations and institutional missions. The Ohio Valley Conference is not requesting elimination of the eight-year rule. Reclassified institutions that have not joined a conference with at least eight consecutive years of automatic qualification status would still wait eight years. It is important to note that this amendment does not require additional revenue distribution of the basketball pool, nor does it create another conference bid.

Committee Position (Executive Committee): The committee voted to oppose this proposal. The committee denied the Ohio Valley Conference's appeal of this matter at its May 1993 meeting, and its reason for voting to oppose the proposal is essentially the same; that is, the request has been considered by the Divi-

sion I Championships Committee and the Division I Men's Basketball Committee, and both committees noted that the current regulation is specifically intended to limit automatic qualifiers to those institutions that have made at least an eight-year commitment to Division I, and to the Division I Men's Basketball Championship.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 161 (NO. 2-131) CHAMPIONSHIPS — MIXED TEAM

Intent: To indicate that a mixed team is one on which at least one individual of each gender competes, as opposed to being eligible to compete.

Bylaws: Amend 18.02.2, page 307, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"18.02.2 Mixed Team. A mixed team is a varsity intercollegiate sports team on which at least one individual of each sex is certified by a member institution as eligible to competes (see 18.2.8.3)."

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Recent interpretations indicate that it is permissible for an institution to permit males to practice with its women's teams and vice versa, under certain specified conditions. This proposal will amend the definition of a "mixed team" to permit such practice to occur without causing such a team to be considered a "mixed team."

Action: Adopted.

Deregulation

The NCAA Legislative Review Committee has identified the following proposals to facilitate the deregulation of the Association's recruiting legislation. The NCAA Council has approved the submission of these proposals to the membership as a "deregulation package." While these proposals are being submitted as a package, they will be voted on separately in the appropriate business session. In addition, Proposal Nos. 40 and 41, which also are part of the "deregulation package" appear in the Presidents Commission Grouping.

NO. 162 (Dereg. 3) RECRUITMENT

Intent: To specify an all-inclusive list of activities that identify a prospective student-athlete as a recruited prospect.

Bylaws: Amend 13.02.9, page 79, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.02.9 Recruiting. Recruiting is any solicitation of the prospect or the prospect's family (or guardian) by an institutional staff member or by a representative of the institution's athletics in-

terests for the purpose of securing the prospect's enrollment and ultimate participation in the institution's intercollegiate athletics program.

"13.02.9.1 Activities Constituting Recruitment Recruited Prospective Student-Athlete. Actions by staff members or athletics representatives that cause a prospective student-athlete to become a recruited prospective student-athlete at that institution include, but are not limited to, the following are:

- "(a) Providing transportation to the prospect to visit the institution's campus.
- "(b) Entertaining the prospect in any way on the campus, except the institution may provide a complimentary admission to an on-campus athletics contest in which its team competes when the prospect visits the institution as a member of an athletics or nonathletics group tour unrelated to athletics recruitment.
- "(a) Providing the prospect with an official visit;**
- "(b) An arranged, in-person, off-campus encounter with the prospect or the prospect's parent(s) or legal guardians, or**
- "(c) Initiating or arranging a telephone contact with the prospect, family member or guardian on more than one occasion for the purpose of recruitment;.
- "(d) Visiting a prospect, family member or guardian for the purpose of recruitment.
- "(e) Entertaining family members or guardians of a prospect on the institution's campus.
- "(f) Forwarding of correspondence to a prospect, other than a generic letter providing or requesting general information, or
- "(g) Arrangement (as permitted under applicable division legislation) of meals, housing, transportation and academic interviews during an unofficial visit.
- "13.02.9.2 Activities Not Constituting Recruitment** Recruitment is not considered to have occurred if:
 - "(a) The staff member or representative comes in normal contact (without pre-arrangement) with the prospect or members of the prospect's family (or guardian) and exhibits normal civility, excluding any attempts to recruit the prospect.
 - "(b) The staff member requests via mail a prospect or family member (or guardian) to return a questionnaire relative to the prospect's high-school, preparatory school or two-year college record.
 - "(c) The institution provides a complimentary admission to the prospect (when the prospect visits the institution as a member of an athletics or nonathletics group tour unrelated to athletics recruitment) to attend an on-campus intercollegiate athletics event in which the institution's team competes;
 - "(d) The institution pays a fee required by the appropriate testing agency to obtain a prospect's official ACT or SAT score(s) (the institution may provide a check payable to the testing agency for this purpose).
 - "(e) A prospective student-athlete initiates a telephone conversation with a coaching staff member for the purpose of trying out for (e.g., 'walking on'

to) the institution's team, with the understanding that the coach provides the prospect information regarding practice or meeting schedules (e.g., time, place, date) and does not utilize the conversation to solicit the prospect's enrollment, or

"(f) Forwarding of generic letters, which may be personalized only in the address and salutation."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994; for those students entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The Legislative Review Committee believes that the current legislation is difficult for institutions to monitor and determine whether a prospect was recruited, inasmuch as the lists of those activities that do and do not constitute recruitment are fairly extensive. Reducing the activities that constitute recruitment to three very specific circumstances and eliminating the list of situations that do not constitute recruitment will simplify the determination of whether a prospect has been recruited.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I, II and III.

NO. 163 (Dereg. 5-A) ONE-VISIT-PER-WEEK LIMIT ON VISITS TO PROSPECT'S HIGH SCHOOL — SPORTS OTHER THAN FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL

Intent: In sports other than football and basketball, to eliminate the one-per-week limitation on visits to a prospect's educational institution.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.4, page 85, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.1.4 Visit to Prospect's Educational Institution — Football and Basketball. In the sports of football and basketball, institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week within a contact period, regardless of the number of prospects enrolled in the institution or whether any prospect is contacted on that occasion.

"13.1.4.1 Approval by Executive Officer. All such visits must receive the approval of the executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative) of the prospect's educational institution.

"13.1.4.2 Visits During Contact Period — Divisions I-A and I-AA Football. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than three days during the football contact period.

"13.1.4.3 Multiple Sport Athlete. If a prospect is a multi-sport athlete being recruited by the same institution for more than one sport, all staff members from the same insti-

tution are permitted only one visit per week to the prospect's educational institution and all visits must take place on the same day of the week.

"13.1.4.4 Tournament Exceptions. In all sports other than Divisions I-A and I-AA football, **the sport of basketball**, visiting a prospect's educational institution on consecutive days during a particular week to observe a tournament or tier of a tournament shall count as a single visit.

"13.1.4.5 Competition Not Involving Educational Institution Visited. An institution does not utilize its one visit per week at an educational institution if the coach observes competition between prospects who do not attend that institution and the coach does not engage in recruitment activities with any prospect who attends the institution where the competition is being conducted.

"13.1.5 Visits to Prospect's Educational Institution — Sports Other than Football and Basketball. In sports other than football and basketball, visits to a prospect's educational institution must receive the approval of the executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative) of the prospect's educational institution."
[13.1.5 through 13.1.8, renumbered as 13.1.6 through 13.1.9, unchanged.]

Source. NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The current legislation prohibiting coaching staff members from visiting a prospect's educational institution more than once per week has a sound basis in that it minimizes the disruption of prospects' lives; however, it also is a good example of well-intended legislation that has imposed significant administrative and compliance burdens, and for which a number of interpretations have been issued. It appears that the primary abuses in this area occurred in the sports of football and basketball. Deleting the once-per-week restriction in sports other than football and basketball simplifies the legislation, eliminates the need for these additional interpretations and arguably makes it easier for institutions to comply.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

NO. 164 (Dereg. 5-B) ONE-VISIT-PER WEEK LIMIT ON VISITS TO PROSPECT'S HIGH SCHOOL — FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL

Intent. In the sports of football and basketball, to eliminate the one-visit-per-week limitation to a prospect's educational institution.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.4, page 84, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football, divided vote]

A-202 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

"13.1.4 Visit to Prospect's Educational Institution — Sports Other than Football. In sports other than football, institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week within a contact period, regardless of the number of prospects enrolled in the institution or whether any prospect is contacted on that occasion.

"13.1.4.1 Approval by Executive Officer. All such visits must receive the approval of the executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative) of the prospect's educational institution.

"13.1.4.2 Visits During Contact Period — Divisions I-A and I-AA Football. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than three days during the football contact period.

"13.1.4.3 13.1.4.2 Multiple Sport Athlete. If a prospect is a multisport athlete being recruited by the same institution for more than one sport, all staff members from the same institution are permitted only one visit per week to the prospect's educational institution and all visits must take place on the same day of the week.

"13.1.4.4 13.1.4.3 Tournament Exceptions. In all sports other than Divisions I-A and I-AA football, visiting a prospect's educational institution on consecutive days during a particular week to observe a tournament or tier of a tournament shall count as a single visit.

"13.1.4.5 13.1.4.4 Competition Not Involving Educational Institution Visited. An institution does not utilize its one visit per week at an educational institution if the coach observes competition between prospects who do not attend that institution and the coach does not engage in recruitment activities with any prospect who attends the institution where the competition is being conducted.

"13.1.5 Visit to Prospect's Educational Institution — Football. In the sport of football, visits to a prospect's educational institution must receive the approval of the executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative) of the prospect's educational institution."
[13.1.5 through 13.1.8, renumbered as 13.1.6 through 13.1.9, unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.4, page 84, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.1.4 Visit to Prospect's Educational Institution — Sports Other than Basketball. In sports other than basketball, institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week within a contact period, regardless of the number of prospects enrolled in the institution or whether any prospect is contacted on that occasion.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-203

"13.1.4.1 Approval by Executive Officer. All such visits must receive the approval of the executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative) of the prospect's educational institution.

"13.1.4.2 Visits During Contact Period — Divisions I-A and I-AA Football. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than three days during the football contact period.

"13.1.4.3 Multiple Sport Athlete. If a prospect is a multi-sport athlete being recruited by the same institution for more than one sport, all staff members from the same institution are permitted only one visit per week to the prospect's educational institution and all visits must take place on the same day of the week.

"13.1.4.4 Tournament Exceptions. *in all sports other than Divisions I-A and I-AA football*, visiting a prospect's educational institution on consecutive days during a particular week to observe a tournament or tier of a tournament shall count as a single visit.

"13.1.4.5 Competition Not Involving Educational Institution Visited. An institution does not utilize its one visit per week at an educational institution if the coach observes competition between prospects who do not attend that institution and the coach does not engage in recruitment activities with any prospect who attends the institution where the competition is being conducted.

"13.1.5 Visit to Prospect's Educational Institution — Basketball. In the sport of basketball, visits to a prospect's educational institution must receive the approval of the executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative) of the prospect's educational institution."

[13.1.5 through 13.1.8, renumbered as 13.1.6 through 13.1.9, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The current legislation prohibiting coaching staff members from visiting a prospect's educational institution more than once per week has a sound basis in that it minimizes the disruption of prospects' lives; however, it also is a good example of well-intended legislation that has imposed significant administrative and compliance burdens, and for which a number of interpretations have been issued. Deleting the once-per-week restriction in the sports of football and basketball simplifies the legislation, eliminates the need for these additional interpretations and arguably makes it easier for institutions to comply.

Action: Part A moot in Divisions I-A and I-AA; adopted by Division II. Part B withdrawn in Division I; adopted by Division II.

A-204 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

NO. 165 (Dereg. 6) CONTACT WITH PARENTS AT SITE OF COMPETITION

Intent: To eliminate the restrictions on contacting a prospect's parent(s) prior to a contest on the day or days of competition.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.6.2, page 86, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.1.6.2 Practice or Competition Site. Recruiting contact may not be made with a prospect *or the prospect's parent* prior to the athletics competition in which the prospect is a participant during the day or days of competition, even if the prospect is on an official or unofficial visit. Such contact shall be governed by the following:

"(a) Contact shall not be made with the prospect *or the parent* at any site prior to the contest on the day or days of competition;

"(b) Contact shall not be made with a prospect *or the parent* from the time the prospect reports on call (at the direction of the prospect's coach or comparable authority) and becomes involved in team activity (e.g., traveling to an away-from-home game) to the end of the competition even if such team activities are initiated prior to the day or days of competition;

[13.1.6.2-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Contact shall not be made with a prospect *(or the prospect's parent)* involved in competition that requires more than one day of participation (e.g., a basketball tournament) until after the prospect's final contest is completed and he or she is released by the appropriate institutional authority and leaves the dressing and meeting facility."

[Remainder of 13.1.6.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The committee believes that the current legislation prohibiting contact with a prospect on the day of the prospect's competition is necessary in order to minimize interference with the prospect's activities; however, it no longer seems necessary to prohibit such contact with the parents of the prospect. Parents of prospects often seek out coaching staff members at the competition site, and it can be awkward and difficult for coaches to indicate that they are not allowed to talk to the parents, and inadvertent violations may result. The elimination of this particular prohibition should assist institutions and coaches in maintaining compliance in this area. It should be noted that such contacts with a prospect's parents at the site of competition would be countable contacts.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I, II and III.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-205

NO. 166 (Dereg. 4) PERMISSIBLE RECRUITERS

Intent: To eliminate the listing of specific examples of the unavoidable incidental contact legislation applicable to "pick-up" games, athletics events, locker-room visits and medical treatment.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.3, pages 81-82, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.1.2.3 General Exceptions. This regulation is not applicable to: [13.1.2.3-(a) through 13.1.2.3-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Unavoidable Incidental Contact. An unavoidable incidental contact made with a prospect by representatives of the institution's athletics interests, provided the contact is not prearranged by the representative or an athletics department staff member, does not take place on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution or at the sites of organized competition and practice involving the prospect or the prospect's team (i.e., high-school, preparatory school, two-year college or all-star team), is not made for the purpose of recruitment of the prospect, and involves only normal civility. Following are examples of the application of unavoidable incidental contacts:

[13.1.2.3-(e)-(1) unchanged.]

"(2) *'Pick-up' Games* Contacts between an athletics representative and a prospect while playing 'pick-up' basketball are permissible if the contacts are incidental, rather than for recruiting purposes

"(3) *Athletics Events* Casual contacts between a prospect and an athletics representative at a member institution's basketball or football game are permissible only if the contacts are incidental (i.e., not prearranged, not for recruiting purposes and involving only normal civility)

"(4) *Locker-Room Visit* A prospect may visit a locker room after a member institution's game when athletics representatives are present in the room; however, when an institution permits athletics representatives in the locker-room area, it does so at its own risk, and any contact with a prospect other than incidental contact would be a violation

[13.1.2.3-(f) and 13.1.2.3-(g) unchanged.]

"(h) *Medical Treatment* An athletics representative who is a doctor or a dentist and who treats a prospect through the normal working relationship with a patient, provided no recruiting contacts are involved."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: By eliminating four specific examples of unavoidable incidental contact between an athletics representative and a prospect, the committee is not attempting to change the application of the current legislation. The committee does believe, however, that these specific examples are commonly understood by the membership to be clear instances of unavoidable incidental contact and that it no longer is necessary to clutter the Manual with their listing.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

NO. 167 (Dereg. 10) VISITS — PARTICIPATION BY PROSPECT IN RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Intent: To permit a prospect visiting a Division I institution to participate in physical workouts or recreational activities during a visit even if the activities involve a sport for which the prospect is being recruited.

Bylaws: Amend 13.12.2.3, page 102, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.12.2.3 Recreational Activities. A prospect visiting a Division I or Division III institution may participate in physical workouts or other recreational activities during a visit to an institution's campus, provided such activities:

"(a) In Division I only, do not involve any sport for which the prospect is being recruited regardless of whether the institution's facilities are open at the time for use by the student body or general public.

"(b) (a) Are not organized or observed by members of the athletics department coaching staff, and

"(c) (b) Are not designed to test the athletics abilities of the prospect for recruiting purposes."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Prospects often need and want to continue their regular physical workouts or recreational activities during a visit to campus and should be allowed to do so, even in the sport for which they are being recruited, provided coaching staff members do not organize or observe the activities.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 168 (Dereg. 2) TELEPHONE CALLS

Intent: To eliminate the once-per-week restriction on telephone calls to prospects in sports other than football and basketball in Divisions I and II

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.4-(b), pages 82-83, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(b) Telephone Contact. In Divisions I and II sports other than Divisions I-A and I-AA football, staff members shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) prior to July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school; thereafter, in **Divisions I and II basketball and Division II football**, staff members shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) more than once per week but may accept collect calls from the prospect. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, staff members shall not telephone a

prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) prior to August 15 following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school. Thereafter, from August 15 through November 30, telephone contact with a prospective student-athlete is limited to once per week. From December 1 through February 15, telephone contact may be made with a senior prospective student-athlete at the institution's discretion. From February 16 through August 14, Divisions I-A and I-AA football staff members shall not telephone a senior prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) more than once per week. In all sports, staff members in Divisions I and II shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) during the conduct of any of the institution's intercollegiate athletics contests in that sport. **There are no restrictions on the number of telephone calls to prospects in sports other than Divisions I and II football and basketball after July 1.**"

[Remainder of 13.1.2.4-(b) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: March 15, 1994.

Rationale: It frequently has been argued that sports other than football and basketball should not be subject to as much or the same level of regulation as the sports of football and basketball, and that much of the current recruiting legislation was enacted because of perceived abuses in the sports of football and basketball. The committee believes that eliminating the one-call-per-week restriction in sports other than football and basketball is an important step in continuing the trend toward more realistic rules for all sports by deregulating in sports other than football and basketball.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 169 (Dereg. 8) TRAVEL TO OFFICIAL VISIT — REIMBURSEMENT

Intent: To permit an institution to pay to the individual incurring the expense the round-trip expenses for transporting a prospect to campus for an official paid visit.

Bylaws: Amend 13.6.2.2, page 92, as follows.

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.6.2.2 Automobile Transportation. When a prospect travels by automobile on an official paid visit, the institution may pay round-trip expenses **to the individual incurring the expense** at the same mileage rate it allows its own personnel. Any automobile may be used by the prospect, provided the automobile is not owned or operated or its use arranged by the institution or any representative of its athletics interests.

"13.6.2.2.1 Prospect's Friends and Relatives A prospect's friends or relatives may receive cost-free transportation to visit a member institution's campus only

by accompanying the prospect at the time the prospect travels in an automobile to visit the campus

"13.6.2.2.2 Nonpermissible Reimbursement If a prospect's automobile travel to the institution's campus for an official visit is at the expense of someone other than the prospect or the prospect's parents or legal guardian(s), the institution may not reimburse the prospect at the permissible mileage rate inasmuch as the prospect has not incurred any transportation expense"

[13.6.2.2.3 renumbered as 13.6.2.2.1, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: March 15, 1994.

Rationale: The committee believes that legislation prohibiting individuals other than a prospect or the prospect's parents or legal guardians from being reimbursed for transporting a prospect to campus for an official visit no longer is necessary. The elimination of this regulation still would not permit an athletics representative to provide such transportation to a prospect, but would allow other friends or family members to provide such transportation and to be reimbursed by the institution for actual mileage.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I, II and III.

NO. 170 (Dereg. 9) PUBLICITY

Intent: To eliminate the restrictions on recruiting publicity in sports other than football and basketball.

Bylaws: Amend 13.11, pages 100-101, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.11 PUBLICITY

"13.11.1 All Sports. The following regulation applies to all sports.

"13.11.1.1 13.11.1.1 Use of Prospect's Photograph. An institution may take a photograph of a prospect during a campus visit to be utilized in the institution's permissible publicity and promotional activities (e.g., press release, media guide), provided the photograph is not given to the prospect.

"13.11.2 Football and Basketball. The following regulations apply only in the sports of football and basketball.

"13.11.1 13.11.2.1 Comments Prior to Signing. Prior to the signing of a prospect to a National Letter of Intent or institutional tender of financial aid, a member institution may comment publicly only to the extent of confirming its recruitment of the prospect. The institution may not comment generally about the prospect's ability or the contribution that the prospect might make to the institution's team; further, the institution is precluded from commenting in any manner as to the likelihood of the prospect's signing with that institution.

^{13.11.1.1} **13.11.2.1.1 Evaluations for Media, Recruiting Services.** Athletics department staff members shall not evaluate or rate a prospect for news media, scouting services or recruiting services prior to the prospect's signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission as a student and/or written tender of financial assistance to be provided upon the prospect's enrollment.

^{13.11.2} **13.11.2.2 Radio/TV Show.** A member institution shall not permit a prospect or a high-school, college preparatory school or two-year college coach to appear, be interviewed or otherwise be involved (in person or via film, audio tape or videotape) on:

- "(a) A radio or television program conducted by the institution's coach;
- "(b) A program in which the institution's coach is participating, or
- "(c) A program for which a member of the institution's athletics staff has been instrumental in arranging for the appearance of the prospect or coach or related program material.

^{13.11.2.1} **13.11.2.2.1 Announcer for High-School Broadcast.** A member of the athletics staff of a member institution may not serve as an announcer or commentator for a high-school, college preparatory school or two-year college contest, or appear (in person or by means of film, audio tape or videotape) on a radio or television broadcast of such contest.

^{13.11.2.2} **13.11.2.2.2 Game Broadcast/Telecast.** A prospect may not be interviewed during the broadcast or telecast of an institution's intercollegiate contest. A member institution may not permit a station telecasting a game to show a videotape of competition involving high-school, preparatory school or two-year college players.

^{13.11.3} **13.11.2.3 Prospect's Visit.** A member institution shall not publicize (or arrange for publicity of) a prospect's visit to the institution's campus.

^{13.11.5} **13.11.2.4 Introduction of Prospect.** An institution may not introduce a visiting prospect at a function (e.g., the institution's sports award banquet or an intercollegiate athletics contest) that is attended by media representatives or open to the general public.

^{13.11.6} **13.11.2.5 Intent to Enroll.** A member institution shall not publicize (or arrange for publicity of) a prospect's intention to accept its offer of financial assistance.

^{13.11.7} **13.11.2.6 Announcement of Signing.** Publicity released by an institution concerning a prospect's commit-

ment to attend the institution shall occur only after the prospect's signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid. Such communications shall be limited to those media forms normally used by the institution.

^{13.11.7.1} **13.11.2.6.1 Media Outlets.** Such communications shall be released only to those media outlets normally used by the institution and by the educational institutions currently and formerly attended by the prospect.

^{13.11.7.2} **13.11.2.6.2 Press Conferences.** Institutional press conferences, receptions, dinners and similar meetings held for the purpose of making such an announcement are expressly prohibited.

^{13.11.7.2.1} **13.11.2.6.2.1 One-Time Exception — Announcement of All Signings.** An institution may make an announcement on the institution's campus for the sole purpose of presenting at one time to the media the names of all prospects who have accepted offers of admission and/or athletically related aid in a particular sport from that institution, with the understanding that no prospects (or their friends or relatives) may be in attendance.

^{13.11.7.2.2} **13.11.2.6.2.2 Independent Announcement by Prospect.** Press conferences to announce a signing may be arranged independently by the prospect (or the prospect's family), provided there is no arrangement or involvement whatsoever by the institution or representatives of its athletics interests.

^{13.11.7.5} **13.11.2.6.3 Press-Release Content.** The contents of a properly issued press release may be determined by the institution and may include comments by its coaching staff members about the abilities of the prospect.

^{13.11.7.3} **13.11.2.6.4 Staff Member Presence.** Institutional staff members are expressly prohibited from personal contact with media representatives at the site of the signing or at any other prearranged site when a prospect accepts an offer made by the institution. This does not preclude the presence of bona fide media representatives who are employed on a part-time basis by the institution.

^{13.11.7.4} **13.11.2.6.5 Signings On Campus.** An institution is responsible for signings on its campus (whether involving an individual or a group of prospects). Any contact by the media with prospects on campus during the time the prospect signs a National Letter of Intent

or tender of financial aid shall be considered to be prima facie evidence of institutional involvement in arranging media involvement and shall be prohibited."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal is in keeping with the current sentiment to avoid over-regulation in sports other than football and basketball. It has been argued that sports other than football and basketball need increased publicity and that it makes sense to eliminate the restrictions on recruiting publicity in those sports.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I, II and III.

NO. 171 (Dereg. 11) CAMPS AND CLINICS — SENIOR PROSPECT PROHIBITION

Intent: To eliminate the prohibition against senior prospects' attendance at member institutions' camps or clinics.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.13.1.2, page 104, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.13.1.2 *Senior Prospect Prohibition* **Attendance Restriction.** A member institution's sports camp or clinic shall be open to any and all entrants (limited only by number and age) except that a 'senior prospect' shall not be permitted to enroll, participate or be employed at any such sports camp or clinic. Senior prospects may enroll or participate, but may not be employed, in those developmental clinics outlined in 13.12.3 1.

"13 13 1.2 1 *Senior Prospects Defined* For purposes of this legislation, a 'senior prospect' is a prospective student-athlete who is eligible for admission to a member institution or who has started classes for the senior year in high school.

"13.13.1.2 2 *No Physical Activity* A 'senior prospect' may attend a camp or clinic, provided the prospect does not participate in any of its physical activities

"13 13.1 2.3 *Preparatory School or Two-Year College Student* A preparatory school or two-year college student is considered to be a 'senior prospect' for purposes of this rule"

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.13.4, page 107, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.13.4 *Privately Owned Camp.* An institution's athletics department personnel may not serve in any capacity (e.g., guest lecturer, consultant) in a privately owned camp, clinic or coaching school in which senior prospects are enrolled, participate or are employed, or in which a high-school, preparatory school or two-year college athletics award winner is employed."

[Remainder of 13.13.4 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The committee believes that the potential recruiting advantage to a member institution by employing a senior prospect who is not an athletics award winner or allowing a senior

A-212 _____ 1994 Convention Proceedings

prospect to be enrolled in the institution's camp or clinic is minimal, inasmuch as many senior prospects will have signed National Letters of Intent by the summer after their senior year. Eliminating the prohibition on the employment of senior prospects who are not athletics award winners will allow the legitimate attendance and/or employment of senior prospects in the community.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I, II and III.

NO. 172 (Dereg. 12) CAMPS AND CLINICS — EMPLOYMENT OF STUDENT-ATHLETES

Intent: To permit a member institution to employ its student-athletes in institutional camps under certain specified conditions and to delete the limitation on the number of members of an institution's men's basketball, football or soccer team who may be employed at the same camp.

A. Bylaws: Delete 13.13.2.1.2, pages 105-106, as follows:
[Division I only]

"13 13 2 1 2 *Division I Sports*

"13.13.2 1 2.1 *Division I Football and Men's Basketball*

"13 13 2 1.2 1 1 *Employment in Specialized Camp — Athlete's Institution* No member of an institution's intercollegiate men's basketball or football squad who has eligibility remaining may be employed or otherwise participate in that institution's basketball or football camp

"13.13.2.1 2.1 2 *Employment in Other Specialized Camps.* A member of an institution's intercollegiate men's basketball or football squad who has eligibility remaining may be employed in any camp that specializes in the sport of basketball or football, other than his own institution's camp, provided not more than one men's basketball or football student-athlete from any one institution is employed

"13 13.2.1.2.1 3 *Employment in Diversified Sports Camp.* A member of an institution's intercollegiate men's basketball or football squad who has eligibility remaining may be employed as a counselor in any diversified camp, including a diversified camp conducted by the student-athlete's own institution, provided no more than one member with eligibility remaining of the previous year's intercollegiate men's basketball or football squad of any one member institution is so employed

"13 13.2.1 2 2 *Division I Soccer.* In Division I, no more than six student-athletes with eligibility remaining from the same member institution's soccer team may be employed (e.g., as counselors) in the same soccer camp or clinic.

"13.13.2.1 2.3 *All Other Division I Sports.* There is no limit (in sports other than football, men's basketball and soccer) on the number of student-athletes in a sport who may be employed in an institutional or noninstitutional (privately owned) camp or clinic."

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.13.2.1.3, page 106, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.13.2.1.3 *Divisions I, II and III — Employment in Own Institution's Camp or Clinic.* In Divisions I, II and III, a member in-

Legislative Proposals _____ A-213

stitution (or employees of its athletics department) may employ its student-athletes as counselors in camps or clinics, subject to the following conditions:

- "(a) The student-athlete shall not participate in organized practice activities other than during the institution's playing season in the sport, and
- "(b) The member institution's director of athletics must give prior approval to the student-athlete's employment arrangement."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Restrictions exist in the current legislation related to the employment of Division I football, basketball and soccer student-athletes in camps/clinics, which require institutions to carefully monitor the employment of their own student-athletes, and the numbers of their student-athletes who work in other institutions' camps/clinics. This proposal would eliminate a number of regulations and would make the employment of student-athletes consistent for all divisions and all sports. The prohibition against participating in organized practice activities outside the institution's playing season and the requirement for approval by the institution's director of athletics should be adequate safeguards against the potential for abuse that led to the current regulations.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 173 (Dereg. 13) CAMPS AND CLINICS — EMPLOYMENT OF HIGH-SCHOOL COACHES

Intent: To make the legislation for employment of high-school, preparatory school or two-year college coaches at a member institution's camp or clinic consistent for Divisions I, II and III.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.13.2.2.1, page 106, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.13.2.2.1 General Rule. A member institution may provide an honorarium or fee to a high-school, preparatory school or two-year college coach who speaks or participates at an institutional camp or clinic, with the understanding that the member institution must be able to document that the honorarium or fee provided to the coach is commensurate with similar fees paid to other individuals for like services"

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.13.2.2.2, page 106, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.13.2.2.2 Divisions I, II and III. In Divisions I, II and III, a member institution (or employees of its athletics department) may employ a high-school, preparatory school or two-year college coach at its camp or clinic, provided:

- "(a) The coach receives compensation that is commensurate with the going rate for camp counselors of like teaching ability and camp experience, and
- "(b) The coach is not paid on the basis of the value the coach may have for the employer because of the coach's reputation or contact with prospective student-athletes."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Adoption of this proposal simplifies regulations concerning the employment of a high-school, preparatory school or two-year college coach at the camp of a member institution (or employees of its athletics department). It establishes two critical tests for such employment based on the going rate of compensation for such work and on a restriction against payment on the basis of the value the coach may have for the employer because of the coach's reputation or contact with prospects. The current provisions of Bylaw 13.13.2.2.1 are not needed because they merely apply the same restrictions as Bylaw 13.13.2.2.2-(a).

Action: Part A adopted by Divisions I, II and III. Part B adopted by Division I.

NO. 174 RESOLUTION: REVIEW OF INITIAL-ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

[Division I only]

"Whereas, the Association's constitution directs that legislation adopted by the Association be designed to advance one or more of the Association's basic principles, including the principle of sound academic standards and the principle of nondiscrimination; and

"Whereas, the Division I membership at the 1992 Convention adopted Proposal No. 16 [now Bylaw 14.3], legislation establishing new initial-eligibility standards for student-athletes; and

"Whereas, fundamental concerns of the Association in the development and adoption of 1992 Convention Proposal No. 16 were the need to enhance the academic integrity of intercollegiate athletics programs and to encourage the adequate academic preparation of student-athletes, without unfairly limiting educational opportunities for student-athletes; and

"Whereas, the effective date of 1992 Convention Proposal No. 16 was established as August 1, 1995, to provide prospective student-athletes fair opportunity to become aware of and meet the new standards and also to allow continued Association review of the standards prior to their implementation; and

"Whereas, the 1995 Convention will be the last opportunity to amend the standards before they become effective;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council direct appropriate NCAA committees to undertake a thorough review of 1992 Convention Proposal No. 16, including a review of all available research on its impact, particularly its impact on minority student-athletes, and a review of the level of understanding among prospective student-athletes, high-school coaches and counselors of the Association's initial-eligibility standards; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that such committees report to the Council and the Presidents Commission by June 1994 the results of their review and, if they deem it appropriate, any recommendations

to maintain or to amend, delay or otherwise change 1992 Convention Proposal No. 16."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Adopted by Division I, 311-10, two abstentions.

Appendix B

Roll-Call Voting

This is a summary of the 86 roll-call votes that were conducted at the 1994 NCAA Convention in San Antonio, Texas.

Each column represents a roll-call vote at the Convention. The number at the head of each column is the proposal number. Where letters are indicated, the reference is to parts of multipart proposals included in that vote. Proposals considered in more than one division

PROPOSAL	Div	11	12	12	12	12	12	12	13	14	14
		A	AD	ADN	F	G	I	AF	FG	N	
		(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)	(VI)	(VII)	(VIII)	(IX)	(X)
ADLERNE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
ADAMS STATE COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ADRIAN UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AGNES SCOTT COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALABAMA A&M UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALABAMA STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA-TUSCALOOSA	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA-BIRMINGHAM	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA-HUNTSVILLE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA-ANCHORAGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA-FAIRBANKS	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALBANY STATE COLLEGE (GEORGIA)	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALBION COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALCORN STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALFRED UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALLEGHENY COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALLENDALE COLLEGE OF ST. FRANCIS OF SALES	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALMA COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AMHERST COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ANDERSON UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ANGELO STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ANNA MARIA COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
APPLAGHAN STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS-FAVETTEVILLE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS-LITTLE ROCK	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ARMSTRONG STATE COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ASHLAND UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ASSUMPTION COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ATLANTIC 10 CONFERENCE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ATLANTIC COAST CONFERENCE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AUBURN UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AUGSBURG COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AUGUSTA COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AUGUSTANA COLLEGE (ILLINOIS)	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AUGUSTANA COLLEGE (SOUTH DAKOTA)	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AURORA UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BALL STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BARD COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BARRY UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BATES COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BEAVER COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BELLARMIN COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BEAUMONT STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BENNETT COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BENTLEY COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BEREA COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BERNARD M. BARUCH COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BETHANY COLLEGE (WEST VIRGINIA)	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BETHEL COLLEGE (MINNESOTA)	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BETHUNE COOKMAN COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BIG EAST CONFERENCE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BIG EIGHT CONFERENCE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BIG SKY CONFERENCE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BIG SOUTH CONFERENCE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BIG TEN CONFERENCE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

business session are reported in separate columns labeled by division.

The votes published on pages A-218 through A-239 include Proposals Nos. 11 through 30 (except for proposals that were withdrawn or not moved for consideration). A summary of the other 43 roll-call votes — Proposal Nos. 31 through 53 and Proposal No. 174 — are published on pages A-238 through A-259.

PROPOSAL	Div	11	12	12	12	12	12	12	13	14	14
		A	AD	ADN	F	G	I	AF	FG	N	
		(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)	(VI)	(VII)	(VIII)	(IX)	(X)
ADLERNE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
ADAMS STATE COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ADRIAN UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AGNES SCOTT COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALABAMA A&M UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALABAMA STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA-TUSCALOOSA	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA-BIRMINGHAM	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA-HUNTSVILLE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA-ANCHORAGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA-FAIRBANKS	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALBANY STATE COLLEGE (GEORGIA)	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALBION COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALCORN STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALFRED UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALLEGHENY COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALLENDALE COLLEGE OF ST. FRANCIS OF SALES	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALMA COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AMHERST COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ANDERSON UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ANGELO STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ANNA MARIA COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
APPLAGHAN STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS-FAVETTEVILLE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS-LITTLE ROCK	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ARMSTRONG STATE COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ASHLAND UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ASSUMPTION COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ATLANTIC 10 CONFERENCE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ATLANTIC COAST CONFERENCE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AUBURN UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AUGSBURG COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AUGUSTA COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AUGUSTANA COLLEGE (ILLINOIS)	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AUGUSTANA COLLEGE (SOUTH DAKOTA)	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AURORA UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BALL STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BARD COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BARRY UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BATES COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BEAVER COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BELLARMIN COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BEAUMONT STATE UNIVERSITY	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BENNETT COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BENTLEY COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BEREA COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BERNARD M. BARUCH COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BETHANY COLLEGE (WEST VIRGINIA)	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BETHEL COLLEGE (MINNESOTA)	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BETHUNE COOKMAN COLLEGE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BIG EAST CONFERENCE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BIG EIGHT CONFERENCE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BIG SKY CONFERENCE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BIG SOUTH CONFERENCE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BIG TEN CONFERENCE	I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

[illegible]

[illegible]

	(A)	(AA)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	(O)	(P)	(Q)	(R)	(S)	(T)	(U)	(V)	(W)	(X)	(Y)	(Z)	(AA)	(AB)	(AC)	(AD)	(AE)	(AF)	(AG)	(AH)	(AI)	(AJ)	(AK)	(AL)	(AM)	(AN)	(AO)	(AP)	(AQ)	(AR)	(AS)	(AT)	(AU)	(AV)	(AW)	(AX)	(AY)	(AZ)	(BA)	(BB)	(BC)	(BD)	(BE)	(BF)	(BG)	(BH)	(BI)	(BJ)	(BK)	(BL)	(BM)	(BN)	(BO)	(BP)	(BQ)	(BR)	(BS)	(BT)	(BU)	(BV)	(BW)	(BX)	(BY)	(BZ)	(CA)	(CB)	(CC)	(CD)	(CE)	(CF)	(CG)	(CH)	(CI)	(CJ)	(CK)	(CL)	(CM)	(CN)	(CO)	(CP)	(CQ)	(CR)	(CS)	(CT)	(CU)	(CV)	(CW)	(CX)	(CY)	(CZ)	(DA)	(DB)	(DC)	(DD)	(DE)	(DF)	(DG)	(DH)	(DI)	(DJ)	(DK)	(DL)	(DM)	(DN)	(DO)	(DP)	(DQ)	(DR)	(DS)	(DT)	(DU)	(DV)	(DW)	(DX)	(DY)	(DZ)	(EA)	(EB)	(EC)	(ED)	(EE)	(EF)	(EG)	(EH)	(EI)	(EJ)	(EK)	(EL)	(EM)	(EN)	(EO)	(EP)	(EQ)	(ER)	(ES)	(ET)	(EU)	(EV)	(EW)	(EX)	(EY)	(EZ)	(FA)	(FB)	(FC)	(FD)	(FE)	(FF)	(FG)	(FH)	(FI)	(FJ)	(FK)	(FL)	(FM)	(FN)	(FO)	(FP)	(FQ)	(FR)	(FS)	(FT)	(FU)	(FV)	(FW)	(FX)	(FY)	(FZ)	(GA)	(GB)	(GC)	(GD)	(GE)	(GF)	(GG)	(GH)	(GI)	(GJ)	(GK)	(GL)	(GM)	(GN)	(GO)	(GP)	(GQ)	(GR)	(GS)	(GT)	(GU)	(GV)	(GW)	(GX)	(GY)	(GZ)	(HA)	(HB)	(HC)	(HD)	(HE)	(HF)	(HG)	(HH)	(HI)	(HJ)	(HK)	(HL)	(HM)	(HN)	(HO)	(HP)	(HQ)	(HR)	(HS)	(HT)	(HU)	(HV)	(HW)	(HX)	(HY)	(HZ)	(IA)	(IB)	(IC)	(ID)	(IE)	(IF)	(IG)	(IH)	(II)	(IJ)	(IK)	(IL)	(IM)	(IN)	(IO)	(IP)	(IQ)	(IR)	(IS)	(IT)	(IU)	(IV)	(IW)	(IX)	(IY)	(IZ)	(JA)	(JB)	(JC)	(JD)	(JE)	(JF)	(JG)	(JH)	(JI)	(JJ)	(JK)	(JL)	(JM)	(JN)	(JO)	(JP)	(JQ)	(JR)	(JS)	(JT)	(JU)	(JV)	(JW)	(JX)	(JY)	(JZ)	(KA)	(KB)	(KC)	(KD)	(KE)	(KF)	(KG)	(KH)	(KI)	(KJ)	(KK)	(KL)	(KM)	(KN)	(KO)	(KP)	(KQ)	(KR)	(KS)	(KT)	(KU)	(KV)	(KW)	(KX)	(KY)	(KZ)	(LA)	(LB)	(LC)	(LD)	(LE)	(LF)	(LG)	(LH)	(LI)	(LJ)	(LK)	(LM)	(LN)	(LO)	(LP)	(LQ)	(LR)	(LS)	(LT)	(LU)	(LV)	(LW)	(LX)	(LY)	(LZ)	(MA)	(MB)	(MC)	(MD)	(ME)	(MF)	(MG)	(MH)	(MI)	(MJ)	(MK)	(ML)	(MN)	(MO)	(MP)	(MQ)	(MR)	(MS)	(MT)	(MU)	(MV)	(MW)	(MX)	(MY)	(MZ)	(NA)	(NB)	(NC)	(ND)	(NE)	(NF)	(NG)	(NH)	(NI)	(NJ)	(NK)	(NL)	(NM)	(NN)	(NO)	(NP)	(NQ)	(NR)	(NS)	(NT)	(NU)	(NV)	(NW)	(NX)	(NY)	(NZ)	(OA)	(OB)	(OC)	(OD)	(OE)	(OF)	(OG)	(OH)	(OI)	(OJ)	(OK)	(OL)	(OM)	(ON)	(OO)	(OP)	(OQ)	(OR)	(OS)	(OT)	(OU)	(OV)	(OW)	(OX)	(OY)	(OZ)	(PA)	(PB)	(PC)	(PD)	(PE)	(PF)	(PG)	(PH)	(PI)	(PJ)	(PK)	(PL)	(PM)	(PN)	(PO)	(PP)	(PQ)	(PR)	(PS)	(PT)	(PU)	(PV)	(PW)	(PX)	(PY)	(PZ)	(QA)	(QB)	(QC)	(QD)	(QE)	(QF)	(QG)	(QH)	(QI)	(QJ)	(QK)	(QL)	(QM)	(QN)	(QO)	(QP)	(QQ)	(QR)	(QS)	(QT)	(QU)	(QV)	(QW)	(QX)	(QY)	(QZ)	(RA)	(RB)	(RC)	(RD)	(RE)	(RF)	(RG)	(RH)	(RI)	(RJ)	(RK)	(RL)	(RM)	(RN)	(RO)	(RP)	(RQ)	(RR)	(RS)	(RT)	(RU)	(RV)	(RW)	(RX)	(RY)	(RZ)	(SA)	(SB)	(SC)	(SD)	(SE)	(SF)	(SG)	(SH)	(SI)	(SJ)	(SK)	(SL)	(SM)	(SN)	(SO)	(SP)	(SQ)	(SR)	(SS)	(ST)	(SU)	(SV)	(SW)	(SX)	(SY)	(SZ)	(TA)	(TB)	(TC)	(TD)	(TE)	(TF)	(TG)	(TH)	(TI)	(TJ)	(TK)	(TL)	(TM)	(TN)	(TO)	(TP)	(TQ)	(TR)	(TS)	(TT)	(TU)	(TV)	(TW)	(TX)	(TY)	(TZ)	(UA)	(UB)	(UC)	(UD)	(UE)	(UF)	(UG)	(UH)	(UI)	(UJ)	(UK)	(UL)	(UM)	(UN)	(UO)	(UP)	(UQ)	(UR)	(US)	(UT)	(UU)	(UV)	(UW)	(UX)	(UY)	(UZ)	(VA)	(VB)	(VC)	(VD)	(VE)	(VF)	(VG)	(VH)	(VI)	(VJ)	(VK)	(VL)	(VM)	(VN)	(VO)	(VP)	(VQ)	(VR)	(VS)	(VT)	(VU)	(VV)	(VW)	(VX)	(VY)	(VZ)	(WA)	(WB)	(WC)	(WD)	(WE)	(WF)	(WG)	(WH)	(WI)	(WJ)	(WK)	(WL)	(WM)	(WN)	(WO)	(WP)	(WQ)	(WR)	(WS)	(WT)	(WU)	(WV)	(WW)	(WX)	(WY)	(WZ)	(XA)	(XB)	(XC)	(XD)	(XE)	(XF)	(XG)	(XH)	(XI)	(XJ)	(XK)	(XL)	(XM)	(XN)	(XO)	(XP)	(XQ)	(XR)	(XS)	(XT)	(XU)	(XV)	(XW)	(XX)	(XY)	(XZ)	(YA)	(YB)	(YC)	(YD)	(YE)	(YF)	(YG)	(YH)	(YI)	(YJ)	(YK)	(YL)	(YM)	(YN)	(YO)	(YP)	(YQ)	(YR)	(YS)	(YT)	(YU)	(YV)	(YW)	(YX)	(YY)	(YZ)	(ZA)	(ZB)	(ZC)	(ZD)	(ZE)	(ZF)	(ZG)	(ZH)	(ZI)	(ZJ)	(ZK)	(ZL)	(ZM)	(ZN)	(ZO)	(ZP)	(ZQ)	(ZR)	(ZS)	(ZT)	(ZU)	(ZV)	(ZW)	(ZX)	(ZY)	(ZZ)
--	-----	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

[illegible][illegible]

14 14 14 14 14 15 16-1 17 18 19 20 21 21 22 23 23 23-1 23-1 23-2 23-2 23-3 23-5 24 24 24 27 27 1 28 28 30 30
J N D P Q R ABO ACO B (7) (24) (1) (4) (4) (4) (4) A A A B RAI UR RAI RAI

[illegible]

[illegible]

J	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	AK	AL	AM	AN	AO	AP	AQ	AR	AS	AT	AU	AV	AW	AX	AY	AZ	BA	BB	BC	BD	BE	BF	BG	BH	BI	BJ	BK	BL	BM	BN	BO	BP	BQ	BR	BS	BT	BU	BV	BW	BX	BY	BZ	CA	CB	CC	CD	CE	CF	CG	CH	CI	CJ	CK	CL	CM	CN	CO	CP	CQ	CR	CS	CT	CU	CV	CW	CX	CY	CZ	DA	DB	DC	DD	DE	DF	DG	DH	DI	DJ	DK	DL	DM	DN	DO	DP	DQ	DR	DS	DT	DU	DV	DW	DX	DY	DZ	EA	EB	EC	ED	EE	EF	EG	EH	EI	EJ	EK	EL	EM	EN	EO	EP	EQ	ER	ES	ET	EU	EV	EW	EX	EY	EZ	FA	FB	FC	FD	FE	FF	FG	FH	FI	FJ	FK	FL	FM	FN	FO	FP	FQ	FR	FS	FT	FU	FV	FW	FX	FY	FZ	GA	GB	GC	GD	GE	GF	GG	GH	GI	GJ	GK	GL	GM	GN	GO	GP	GQ	GR	GS	GT	GU	GV	GW	GX	GY	GZ	HA	HB	HC	HD	HE	HF	HG	HH	HI	HJ	HK	HL	HM	HN	HO	HP	HQ	HR	HS	HT	HU	HV	HW	HX	HY	HZ	IA	IB	IC	ID	IE	IF	IG	IH	II	IJ	IK	IL	IM	IN	IO	IP	IQ	IR	IS	IT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	JA	JB	JC	JD	JE	JF	JG	JH	JI	IJ	JK	JL	JM	JN	JO	JP	JQ	JR	JS	JT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	KA	KB	KC	KD	KE	KF	KG	KH	KI	KJ	KK	KL	KM	KN	KO	KP	KQ	KR	KS	KT	KU	KV	KW	KX	KY	KZ	LA	LB	LC	LD	LE	LF	LG	LH	LI	LJ	LK	LL	LM	LN	LO	LP	LQ	LR	LS	LT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	MA	MB	MC	MD	ME	MF	MG	MH	MI	MJ	MK	ML	MM	MN	MO	MP	MQ	MR	MS	MT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	NA	NB	NC	ND	NE	NF	NG	NH	NI	NJ	NK	NL	NM	NN	NO	NP	NQ	NR	NS	NT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	OA	OB	OC	OD	OE	OF	OG	OH	OI	OJ	OK	OL	OM	ON	OO	OP	OQ	OR	OS	OT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	PA	PB	PC	PD	PE	PF	PG	PH	PI	PJ	PK	PL	PM	PN	PO	PP	PQ	PR	PS	PT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	QA	QB	QC	QD	QE	QF	QG	QH	QI	QJ	QK	QL	QM	QN	QO	QP	QQ	QR	QS	QT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	RA	RB	RC	RD	RE	RF	RG	RH	RI	RJ	RK	RL	RM	RN	RO	RP	RQ	RR	RS	RT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	SA	SB	SC	SD	SE	SF	SG	SH	SI	SJ	SK	SL	SM	SN	SO	SP	SQ	SR	SS	ST	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	TA	TB	TC	TD	TE	TF	TG	TH	TI	TJ	TK	TL	TM	TN	TO	TP	TQ	TR	TS	TT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	UA	UB	UC	UD	UE	UF	UG	UH	UI	UJ	UK	UL	UM	UN	UO	UP	UQ	UR	US	UT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	VA	VB	VC	VD	VE	VF	VG	VH	VI	VJ	VK	VL	VM	VN	VO	VP	VQ	VR	VS	VT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	WA	WB	WC	WD	WE	WF	WG	WH	WI	WJ	WK	WL	WM	WN	WO	WP	WQ	WR	WS	WT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	XA	XB	XC	XD	XE	XF	XG	XH	XI	XJ	XK	XL	XM	XN	XO	XP	XQ	XR	XS	XT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	YA	YB	YC	YD	YE	YF	YG	YH	YI	YJ	YK	YL	YM	YN	YO	YP	YQ	YR	YS	YT	IU	IV	IW	IX	IY	IZ	ZA	ZB	ZC	ZD	ZE	ZF	ZG	ZH	ZI	ZJ	ZK	ZL	ZM	ZN	Z
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	---

[illegible]

A-240

[illegible]

[illegible]

Roll-Call Voting

— A-251

A-253

[illegible]

[illegible]

Institution	Div	31	31	31	32	33	33	34	35-1	35	36-1	36	38	REC	MTS	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
-------------	-----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	------	----	------	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Vote totals

No. 31—Part A defeated by Division I-A, 47-63-1. Part B defeated upon reconsideration by Division I-AA, 37-67-13. No. 32—Defeated by Division I-AA, 42-59-18. No. 33—Adopted (Division I-A, 84-27-1; Division I-AA, 93-24-1). No. 34—Parts A and C in Division I-A moot. Parts B and D adopted by Division I, 216-105-7. No. 35—Parts A through C as amended by 35-1 adopted by Division I, 250-71-3. Part D in Division I-A moot. No. 35-1—Adopted in Division I, 290-30-2. No. 36—Moot. No. 37—Moot. No. 38—Part A adopted by Division I-A, 61-44-1; adopted as amended by 38-1 by Division I-AA, 91-23-5, Parts B and C adopted by Division I, 237-90. No. 38-1—Not moved in Division I-A, adopted in Division I-AA, 97-15-5. No. 39—Adopted (Division I, 182-141-5, Division III, 266-9). No. 40—Adopted as amended by 40-1 in Division I, 277-45-4, adopted, upon reconsideration, as amended by 40-2 in Division II, 201-10-1. No. 40-1—Adopted in Division I, 191-127-7. No. 40-2—Moot in Division I, adopted in

Division II, 170-46. No. 40-3—Moot. No. 41—Adopted (Division I-A, 106-8; Division I-AA, 118-0; Division II, 128-6).

No. 42—Defeated by Division I, 119-191-17. No. 43—Defeated by Division I-A, 34-73-5, not moved in Division I. No. 44—Adopted by Division I-A, 97-11. No. 45—Adopted as amended by 45-2 and 45-3 by Division I-AA, 92-22-5. No. 45-1—Withdrawn. No. 45-2—Adopted by Division I-AA, 93-18-6. No. 45-3—Adopted by Division I-AA, 91-25-2. No. 46—Adopted by Division I-A, 58-55-1; motion to reconsider defeated, 55-55-1. Adopted by Division I-AA, 99-15-1. No. 47—Adopted (Division I, 266-61-3; Division II, 158-54). No. 48—Moot. No. 49—Part A moot in Divisions I and II. Part B adopted by Division III, 217-58-1. No. 50—Defeated (Division I, 45-268-12; Division II, 50-149-9). No. 51—Defeated by Division III, 64-191-13. No. 52—Adopted 792-2. No. 53—Adopted, 759-1. No. 174—Adopted by Division I, 311-10-2.

Appendix C

88th Annual Convention Committees

Nominating Committee

Chair—Janet R. Kittell

- I-1—Robert W. Mullen, La Salle University
- I-1—Sondra Norrell-Thomas, Howard University
- I-2—R. Daniel Beebe, Ohio Valley Conference
- I-2—Warner Alford, University of Mississippi
- I-3—Linda G. Herman, Illinois State University
- I-3—Robert R. Snell, Kansas State University
- I-4—Thomas C. Hansen, Pacific-10 Conference
- I-4—John V. Kasser, University of California, Santa Barbara
- II-1—Charles A. Eberle, Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
- II-2—Wallace Jackson, Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
- II-3—George W. Eastland, Saginaw Valley State University
- II-4—Janet R. Kittell, California State University, Chico
- III-1—Gregory L. Lockard, Montclair State College
- III-2—Dolores A. Bogard, State University College at Cortland
- III-3—James E. Foels, Oberlin College
- III-4—Curtis W. Tong, Pomona-Pitzer Colleges

Men's Committee on Committees

Chair—Prentice Gautt

- District 1—Chester S. Gladchuk, Boston College
- District 2—Susan Petersen-Lubow, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy
- District 3—William T. "Todd" Turner, North Carolina State University
- District 4—Robert T. Becker, Saginaw Valley State University
- District 5—Prentice Gautt, Big Eight Conference
- District 6—Marino H. Casem, Southern University, Baton Rouge
- District 7—Gary A. Cunningham, California State University, Fresno
- District 8—Timothy J. Dillon, University of Alaska Anchorage
- At Large—Willard S. Belknap, Wichita State University
- At Large—John C. Harper, Bridgewater State College, Massachusetts
- At Large—Daniel L. Bridges, California Institute of Technology
- At Large—Nathan N. Salant, Gulf South Conference

Women's Committee on Committees

Chair—Laurie Priest

- District 1—Laurie Priest, Mount Holyoke College
- District 2—Sharon E. Taylor, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania
- District 3—Bernadette V. McGlade, Georgia Institute of Technology
- District 4—Christine H.B. Grant, University of Iowa
- District 5—Andrea Myers, Indiana State University
- District 6—Margaret Harbison, East Texas State University
- District 7—Katherine E. Noble, University of Montana
- District 8—Carol M. Dunn, California State Univ., Los Angeles
- At Large—Dianne Jones, University of Wisconsin, Whitewater

At Large—Diane Milutinovich, California State University, Fresno
 At Large—Sandy Tillman, Emory University
 At Large—Marilyn Moniz-Kahoohanohano, University of Hawaii,
 Honolulu

Voting Committee

Chair—Barbara G. Walker

- District 1—Debi Field McGrath, Colby-Sawyer College
- District 2—Rich Petriccione, Iona College
- District 3—John R. Gerdy, Southeastern Conference
- District 4—Judy A. Kruckman, Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
- District 5—Jean Berger, Drake University
- District 6—Barbara Jacket, Prairie View A&M University
- District 7—Larry R. Gerlach, University of Utah
- District 8—Albert T. Gonzales, New Mexico State University
- At Large—Sallie Beard, Missouri Southern State College
- At Large—Pete Chapman, Wayne State College (Nebraska)
- At Large—Kathy Lindahl, Michigan State University
- At Large—Hallie E. Gregory, University of Maryland, Eastern Shore
- At Large—Barbara G. Walker, University of Oregon

Memorial Resolutions Committee

Chair—Catherine C. Haker

- Allen F. Ackerman, University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh
- Catherine C. Haker, College of St. Rose
- Judy W. Rose, University of North Carolina, Charlotte

Credentials Committee

Chair—Barbara Bickford

- Barbara Bickford, Brandeis University
- Joseph A. Etzel, University of Portland
- Ronnie O. Spry, Paine College

Parliamentarian

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

Appendix D

Past Convention Sites

Convention	Year	City, Hotel
1st	1906	New York City (Murray Hill)
2nd	1907	New York City (Murray Hill)
3rd	1908	New York City (Murray Hill)
4th	1909	New York City (Murray Hill)
5th	1910	New York City (Astor)
6th	1911	New York City (Astor)
7th	1912	New York City (Astor)
8th	1913	New York City (Astor)
9th	1914	Chicago (LaSalle)
10th	1915	New York City (Astor)
11th	1916	New York City (Astor)
12th	1917	New York City (Astor)
13th	1918	New York City (Astor)
14th	1919	New York City (Astor)
15th	1920	Chicago (Sherman)
16th	1921	New York City (Astor)
17th	1922	New York City (Astor)
18th	1923	Atlanta (Georgian Terrace)
19th	1924	New York City (Astor)
20th	1925	New York City (Astor)
21st	1926	New York City (Astor)
22nd	1927	New York City (Astor)
23rd	1928	New Orleans (Roosevelt)
24th	1929*	New York City (Astor)
25th	1930	New York City (Astor)
26th	1931	New York City (Astor)
27th	1932	New York City (Astor)
28th	1933	Chicago (Stevens)
29th	1934	New York City (Pennsylvania)
30th	1935	New York City (Pennsylvania)
31st	1936	New York City (Pennsylvania)
32nd	1937	New Orleans (St. Charles)
33rd	1938	Chicago (Sherman)
34th	1939	Los Angeles (Biltmore)
35th	1940	New York City (New Yorker)
36th	1941	Detroit (Book-Cadillac)
37th	1942	New York City (Astor)
	1943	No meeting
38th	1944†	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (St. Francis)

*Convened January 1, 1930.

†Officers, Executive Committee and chairs of rules committees only.

44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)
67th	1973	Chicago (Palmer House)
1st Special	1973	Chicago (Regency Hyatt House)
68th	1974	San Francisco (St. Francis)
69th	1975	Washington (Sheraton-Park)
2nd Special	1975	Chicago (Palmer House)
3rd Special	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
70th	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
71st	1977	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau)
72nd	1978	Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza)
73rd	1979	San Francisco (St. Francis)
74th	1980	New Orleans (Fairmont)
75th	1981	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau Hilton)
4th Special	1981	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront)
76th	1982	Houston (Hyatt Regency)
77th	1983	San Diego (Town and Country)
78th	1984	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
79th	1985	Nashville (Opryland)
5th Special	1985	New Orleans (Hyatt Regency)
80th	1986	New Orleans (Hilton Riverside)
81st	1987	San Diego (Town and Country)
6th Special	1987	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
82nd	1988	Nashville (Opryland)
83rd	1989	San Francisco (Hilton)
84th	1990	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
85th	1991	Nashville (Opryland)
86th	1992	Anaheim (Hilton and Towers)
87th	1993	Dallas (Loews Anatole)

Appendix E

NCAA Officers, 1906-1994

Years Name, Institution

President

1906-1913—Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1914-1916—LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
 1917-1929—Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1930-1932—Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
 1933-1937—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1938-1940—William B. Owens, Stanford University
 1941-1944—Phillip O. Badger, New York University
 1945-1946—Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming
 1947-1949—Karl E. Lieb, University of Iowa
 1950-1952—Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
 1953-1954—Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
 1955-1956—Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College
 1957-1958—Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
 1959-1960—Herbert J. Dorricott, Western State College (Colorado)
 1961-1962—Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
 1963-1964—Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
 1965-1966—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1967-1968—Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
 1969-1970—Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
 1971-1972—Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 1973-1974—Alan J. Chapman, Rice University
 1975-1976—John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University
 1977-1978—J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas at Austin
 1979-1980—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1981-1982—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1983-1984—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1985-1986—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1987-1988—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
 1989-1990—Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 1991-1992—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
 1993-1994—Joseph N. Crowley, University of Nevada

Secretary-Treasurer

1906-1908—Louis A. Bevier Jr., Rutgers University, New Brunswick
 1908—William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia (Treasurer only)
 1909-1939—Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
 1940-1944—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1945-1951—Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1952-1954—Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
 1955-1956—Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
 1957-1958—Edwin D. Mouzon Jr., Southern Methodist University

1959-1960—Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
 1961-1962—Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
 1963-1964—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1965-1966—Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
 1967-1968—Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
 1969-1970—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1971-1972—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, University of District of Columbia

1973-1974—Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
 1975-1976—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
 1977-1978—Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College
 1979-1980—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1981-1982—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1983-1984—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1985-1986—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
 1987-1988—Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton
 1989-1990—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
 1991-1992—B. J. Skelton, Clemson University
 1993-1994—Cedric W. Dempsey, University of Arizona

Division I Vice-President

1983-1984—Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University
 1985—Arliss L. Roaden, Tennessee Technological University
 1986—Lewis A. Cryer, Pacific Coast Athletic Association
 1987-1988—Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 1989-1990—B. J. Skelton, Clemson University
 1991—Douglas S. Hobbs, University of California, Los Angeles
 1992-1993—R. Elaine Dreidame, University of Dayton

Division II Vice-President

1983—Edwin W. Lawrence, University of Alaska Fairbanks
 1984-1985—Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University
 1986—Asa N. Green, Livingston University
 1987-1988—Howard Elwell, Gannon University
 1989-1990—Jerry M. Hughes, Central Missouri State University
 1991-1992—Anthony F. Ceddia, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania
 1993-1994—Charles N. Lindemann, Humboldt State University

Division III Vice-President

1983—Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa)
 1984-1985—Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Fitchburg State College
 1986-1987—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
 1988-1989—Alvin J. Van Wie, College of Wooster
 1990-1991—Rocco J. Carzo, Tufts University
 1992-1993—John H. Harvey, Carnegie Mellon University

NATL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOC



INCA00002163P



NCAA 9785-4/94